DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 891 HE 003 850

TITLE	Summary of Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association of Urban Universities (57th, Chicago, Illinois, November 7-8, 1971). Forty-Eighth Report.
INSTITUTION	Association of Urban Universities.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	98p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Budgeting; *Conference Reports; Educational Finance; Educational Philosophy; *Federal Legislation; *Higher Education; *Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Association of Urban Universities

ABSTRACT

Presented in the present document is a report of the 1971 annual meeting of Association of Urban Universities. In addition to reports of various committees of the Association, a history of the Association is presented and addresses by Dr. David Brown of Miami University (Ohio) and Peter B. Muirhead of the Office of Education. Brown's talk addresses the problems of budgeting in urban universities, including questions of why cut budgets in universities at all, how to instigate such cuts, and how to identify the more and less important priorities in an institution. Muirhead's speech, on the other hand, presents a report and analysis of the current legislation and of the critical issues that face higher education as a result of the legislative program in the Congress. (HS)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 074891

The Association of Urban Universities

SUMMARY OF

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Fifty-Seventh Annual Meeting

of

The ASSOCIATION of

URBAN UNIVERSITIES

at Chicago, Illinois

1971

Forty-Eighth Report

HEDU 3850

ED 074891

Fifty-Seventh Annual Meeting

at Chicago, Illinois

1971

Forty-Eighth Report

1971

FIFTY-SEVENTH
ANNUAL MEETING

November 7-8, 1971
Chicago, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Historical Introduction 5

Member Institutions 9

Officers 1970-1971 14

Committees, 1970-1971 14

Program for the Fifty-Seventh Annual Meeting 16

Sunday Evening Session November 7, 1971

Meeting called to order
Lloyd H. Elliott, presiding 18

Address
Dr. David Brown, Executive Vice President for
Academic Affairs, Miami University (Ohio) 19

Adjournment of Sunday Evening Session 40

Monday Morning Session November 8, 1971
Lloyd H. Elliott, presiding 41

Report of Secretary-Treasurer
Robert H. Spiro 42

Report of Auditing Committee
Woodrow M. Strickler 44

Report of Nominating Committee
J. Martin Klotsche 45

Report of Resolutions Committee
Malcolm Carron, S.J. 46

Report of Breakfast Discussions
President Spiro 50
Group I Dr. Robert D. Bell 51
Group II Dr. Robert W. French 53
Group III President A. L. Pugsley 58

Adjournment of Business Session 72

Monday Luncheon Session, November 8, 1971
Lloyd H. Elliott, presiding 73

Address
Peter P. Muirhead, Deputy U. S. Commissioner of
Education, Office of Education 73

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Adjournment of Fifty-Seventh Annual Meeting
Lloyd H. Elliott 84

Appendices

A Constitution of the Association 85
B Chronological List of Officers of the Association 87
C Registered Attendance—Fifty-Seventh Annual Meeting 91
D Financial Report, 1971 94
E Procedure for Application for Membership 96
F Institutional Libraries Holding Complete Sets of the Proceedings of Association's Annual Meetings 97

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

The Association of Urban Universities was founded as the result of a conference "of all municipal universities and other universities in cities interested in the service of their communities," held in connection with the annual meeting of the National Association of State Universities at Washington, D. C., November 9 and 10, 1914. On November 11, 1914, the permanent organization of the Association of Urban Universities was definitely formed. The Association promotes the study of problems of particular interest to urban universities, including adult education, community service, and university extension.

A full report of the proceedings of the first meeting was published by the United States Bureau of Education as Bulletin, 1915, No. 38, under the title, "The University and the Municipality."

The second meeting was held in Cincinnati, November 15, 16, and 17, 1915, and the proceedings were printed as Bulletin, 1916, No. 30, of the Bureau of Education. These two bulletins contain detailed information concerning the formation of the Association, its aims and its practical program.

The third conference was held in New York on November 15, 16, and 17, 1916. A record of this meeting was printed by the Association in 1917, entitled "Field Work — Complete Report of the Committee on Field Work and Account of the Third Annual Meeting of the Association of Urban Universities."

The fourth meeting was held in Pittsburgh, November 15, 16, and 17, 1917. A full report of this meeting was not published, but a summary of the proceedings appeared in the introduction to the printed report of the 1919 meeting of Boston. Because of the war, no meeting was held in 1918.

The fifth conference, at Boston, was held on December 19 and 20, 1919, and the published account of the meeting appeared as the Fourth Report.

In 1920, the sixth meeting was held in Philadelphia, on December 16, 17, and 18, with the University of Pennsylvania, Drexel Institute of Technology, and Temple University acting as hosts. The Printed account of the meeting appeared as the Fifth Report.

No reports of the meetings from 1921 to 1926, inclusive, were published. From 1921 to 1925 the annual meetings were held as follows:

Year	Meeting	Place	Host Institution
1921	7th	Cleveland	Case School of Applied Science and Western Reserve University

1922	8th	Minneapolis	University of Minnesota
1923	9th	Buffalo	University of Buffalo
1924	10th	Akron	University of Akron
1925	11th	Washington	George Washington University

The next meeting, 1926, was held at Providence with Brown University as the host; on the printed program this meeting is numbered as the "thirteenth."

Since 1926, reports of all the meetings have been published. Beginning with 1927, the annual meetings have been held and the reports issued as follows:

Year	Meeting	Place	Host Institution	No. of Report
1927	14th	Pittsburgh	Carnegie Institute of Technology	6th
1928	15th	New York	City College of New York	7th
1929	16th	Cincinnati	University of Cincinnati	
1930	17th	Philadelphia	University of Pennsylvania	8th
1931	18th	Toledo	University of Toledo	9th
1932	19th	St. Louis	Washington University	10th
1933	20th	New York	New York University and The City College of New York	11th
1934	21st	Louisville	University of Louisville	12th
1935	22nd	Boston	Boston University	13th
1936	23rd	Detroit	Wayne University	14th
1937	24th	Birmingham	Birmingham-Southern College	15th
1938	25th	Cincinnati	University of Cincinnati	16th
1939	26th	New York	Hunter College of the City of New York	17th
1940	27th	Omaha	University of Omaha	18th
1941	28th	Cleveland	Western Reserve University and Fenn College	19th

The meeting scheduled to be held in October, 1942, with the University of Rochester as the host institution, was cancelled because of the war.

1943	29th	Chicago	Illinois Institute of Technology	20th
1944	30th	Pittsburgh	Carnegie Institute of Technology, University of Pittsburgh	21st

1945	31st	Philadelphia	Drexel Institute of Technology, University of Pennsylvania and Temple University	22nd
1946	32nd	New York	City College of New York	23rd
1947	33rd	Minneapolis	University of Minnesota	24th
1948	34th	Pittsburgh	University of Pittsburgh	25th
1949	35th	Chicago	- - - - - - - - - - - - -	26th
1950	36th	Cleveland	- - - - - - - - - - - - -	27th
1951	37th	Cincinnati	- - - - - - - - - - - - -	28th
1952	38th	Detroit	University of Detroit and Wayne University	29th
1953	39th	St. Louis	St. Louis University and Washington University	30th
1954	40th	Pittsburgh	Carnegie Institute of Technology, Duquesne University, Pennsylvania College for Women, University of Pittsburgh	31st
1955	41st	Milwaukee	Marquette University	32nd
1956	42nd	Cleveland	Case Institute of Technology, Western Reserve University, and Fenn College	33rd
1957	43rd	Detroit	University of Detroit and Wayne State University	34th
1958	44th	Omaha	Creighton University and University of Omaha	35th
1959	45th	Buffalo	University of Buffalo and Canisius College	36th
1960	46th	Cincinnati	University of Cincinnati and Xavier University	37th
1961	47th	Chicago	DePaul University, Illionis Institute of Technology, Loyola University, Northwestern University, Roosevelt University, University of Illinois	38th
1962	48th	Louisville	University of Louisville	39th
1963	49th	New Orleans	Tulane University	40th
1964	50th	Pittsburgh	Carnegie Institute of Technology, Duquesne University, University of Pittsburgh	41st
1965	51st	St. Louis	St. Louis University and Washington University	42nd

1966	52nd	Milwaukee	Marquette University and University of Wisconsin — Milwaukee	43rd
1967	53rd	Detroit	University of Detroit and Wayne State University	44th
1968	54th	Houston	University of Houston	45th
1969	55th	Akron	University of Akron	46th
1970	56th	Miami	University of Miami	47th
1971	**57th**	**Chicago**	**University of Illinois / Chicago Circle Campus**	**48th**

The Association publishes the Proceedings of its Annual Meeting and distributes a copy to each member institution. A limited number of copies is available for free distribution to interested persons, agencies, and institutions. Requests should be addressed to George A. Flowers, Jr., Director, News Services and Publications, Jacksonville University, Jacksonville, Florida 32211.

MEMBER INSTITUTIONS
November 1971

Below are listed member institutions and their chief executive officers. Charter members are indicated by an asterisk; the date in parentheses following the name of each of the other members indicates the first year of membership.

Adelphi University
Garden City, Long Island, N. Y. (1970)
President Charles Vevier

*Akron, The University of
Akron, Ohio
President Dominic J. Guzzetta

Alabama, University of
in Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama (1971)
President J. F. Volker

American University
Washington, D.C. (1944)
President George H. Williams

Arkansas, University of
Little Rock, Arkansas (1960)
President Carey V. Stabler

Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts
President W. Seavey Joyce, S.J.

*Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts
President John R. Silber

Bradley University
Peoria, Illinois (1947)
Chancellor Talman W. Van Arsdale, Jr.

Bridgeport, University of
Bridgeport, Connecticut (1952)
President Thurston E. Manning

Brooklyn College
See City University of New York

Butler University
Indianapolis, Indiana (1945)
President A. E. Jones

Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio (1948)
President Louis Toepfer

Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C. (1968)
President Clarence C. Walton

Chicago State College
Chicago, Illinois (1967)
President Milton W. Byrd

*Cincinnati, University of
Cincinnati, Ohio
President Warren G. Bennis

*City College of New York
See City University of New York

City University of New York
New York, New York
Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee

Brooklyn College
Brooklyn, New York (1952)
President John W. Kneller

*City College
New York, New York
President Robert E. Marshall

*Hunter College
New York, New York
President Jacqueline G. Wexler

Queens College
Flushing, New York (1939)
President Joseph S. Murphy

Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio (1956)
President Harold L. Enarson

Colorado, University of
Denver Center
Denver, Colorado (1971)
Vice President Joe J. Keen

Cooper Union
Cooper Square, New York, New York (1950)
President John F. White

Creighton University
Omaha, Nebraska (1951)
President John J. Labaj

Dayton, University of
Dayton, Ohio (1962)
President Raymond A. Roesch, S.M.

Delaware, University of
Newark, Delaware (1970)
President Edward A. Trabant
Denver, University of
Denver, Colorado (1915)
Chancellor Maurice B. Mitchell
DePaul University
Chicago, Illinois (1948)
President John R. Cortelyou, C.M.
Detroit, University of
Detroit, Michigan (1932)
President Malcolm Carron, S.J.
Drake University
Des Moines, Iowa (1960)
President Paul F. Sharp
Vice President George Huff
Drexel University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (1915)
President William Walsh Hagerty
Duquesne University
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (1950)
President Henry J. McAnulty, C.S.Sp.

Fairfield University
Fairfield, Connecticut (1970)
President William C. McInnes, S.J.
Fairleigh Dickinson University
Teaneck, New Jersey (1955)
President J. Osborn Fuller
Fordham University
New York, New York (1930)
President Michael P. Walsh, S.J.

General Motors Institute
Flint, Michigan (1962)
President Harold P. Rodes
George Washington University
Washington, D.C. (1924)
President Lloyd H. Elliott
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C. (1968)
President Robert J. Henle, S.J.
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia (1958)
President Noah Langdale, Jr.

Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts (1915)
President Derek C. Bok
Hofstra University
Hempstead, L.I., New York (1954)
President Clifford Lee Lord
Houston, University of
Houston, Texas (1957)
President Philip G. Hoffman
Hunter College
See City University of New York

Illinois Institute of Technology
Chicago, Illinois (1939)
President John T. Rettaliata
Illinois, University of
Urbana, Illinois (1951)
President John E. Corbally
Chancellor Warren B. Cheston
Chicago Circle Campus
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana (1970)
President Alan C. Rankin
Indiana University
Purdue University at Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Indiana (1969)
Chancellor Maynard K. Hine

Jacksonville University
Jacksonville, Florida (1962)
President Robert H. Spiro
Jersey City State College
Jersey City, New Jersey (1970)
President James H. Mullen
John Carroll University
Cleveland, Ohio (1956)
President Henry F. Birkenhauer, S.J.
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland (1968)
President Lincoln Gordon

LaSalle College
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (1970)
President Daniel Burke, F.S.C.
Long Island University
Greenvale, New York (1961)
Chancellor Albert Bush-Brown

*Louisville, University of
Louisville, Kentucky
President Woodrow M. Strickler
Loyola University
Chicago, Illinois (1950)
President Raymond C. Baumhart, S.J.
Loyola University
New Orleans, Louisiana (1963)
President Michael F. Kennelly, S.J.

Maine, University of
Portland, Maine (1969))
President L. J. P. Calisti
Manhattan College
Bronx, New York (1970)
President Gregory Nugent, F.S.C.
Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin (1948)
President John P. Raynor, S.J.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Mass. (1952)
President J. B. Wiesner
Massachusetts, University of
Baston, Massachusetts (1967)
Chancellor Francis L. Broderick
President Robert C. Wood
Amherst, Mass.
Miami, University of
Coral Gables, Florida (1941)
President Henry King Stanford
Mississippi College
Clinton, Mississippi (1965)
President William L. Nobles
Missouri, University of at Kansas City
Kansas City, Missouri (1953)
Chancellor James C. Olson
Monmouth College
West Long Island, New Jersey (1969)
President R. J. Stonesifer

Nebraska, University of, at Omaha
Omaha, Nebraska (1937)
President Acting Chancellor J. V. Blackwell
Newark College of Engineering
Newark, New Jersey (1929)
President William Hazell
New Haven, University of
West Haven, Connecticut (1970)
President Marvin K. Peterson
*New York University
Washington Square, New York, New York
President James M Hester
Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts (1959)
President Asa S. Knowles
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois (1963)
President Rhoten A. Smith
*Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois
Chancellor James R. Miller

Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio (1970)
President Novice G. Fawcett
Oklahoma City University
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma (1952)
President Dolphus Whitten, Jr.
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia (1962)
President James L. Bugg, Jr.

*Pennsylvania, University of
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
President Martin Meyerson
*Pittsburgh, University of
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Chancellor Wesley W. Posvar
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
Brooklyn, New York (1928)
President Benjamin Adler
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon (1957)
President Gregory Baker Wolfe
Pratt Institute
Brooklyn, New York (1941)
President Henry Saltzman
Providence College
Providence, Rhode Island (1951)
President Thomas R. Peterson

Queens College
See City University of New York

Rhode Island College
Providence, Rhole Island (1969)
President Joseph F. Kauffman
Rochester Institute of Technology
Rochester, New York (1968)
President Paul A. Miller
Rochester, University of
Rochester, New York (1968)
President W. Allen Wallis
Roosevelt University
Chicago, Illinois (1947)
President Rolf A. Weil
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
New Brunswick, New Jersey (1946)
President Edward J. Bloustein

Sacred Heart University
Bridegport, Connecticut (1970)
President William H. Conley
Saint John's University
Jamaica, New York (1939)
President Joseph T. Cahill, C.M.
Saint Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri (1948)
President Paul C. Reinert, S.J.
Saint Peter's College
Jersey City, New Jersey (1969)
President Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J.
Samford University
Birmingham, Alabama (1950)
President Leslie S. Wright
San Diego State College
San Diego, California (1970)
Acting President Donald E. Walker
South Alabama, University of
Mobile, Alabama (1969)
President Frederick P. Whiddon
South Florida, University of
Tampa, Florida (1966)
President M. Cecil Mackey
Southern California, University of
Los Angeles, California (1930)
President John R. Hubbard
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois (1958)
Chancellor Robert G. Layer
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas (1952)
President Willis Tate
Southern Mississippi, University of
Hattiesburg, Mississippi (1950)
President William D. McCain
Southwestern at Memphis
Memphis, Tennessee (1936)
President William L. Bowden
*State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York
President Elbert K. Fretwell
Stevens Institute of Technology
Hoboken, New Jersey (1951)
President Jess H. Davis
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York (1915)
Chancellor Melvin A. Eggers

Tampa, University of
Tampa, Florida (1952)
President Bob D. Owens
Chancellor David M. Delo
*Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
President Paul Anderson
Tennessee, University of
Knoxville, Tennessee (1970)
President Edward J. Boling
Tennessee, University of at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee (1969)
President William H. Masterson
Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas (1971)
President G. M. Sawyer
Toledo, University of
Toledo, Ohio
President William S. Carlson
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts (1968)
President Burton C. Hallowell
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana (1954)
President H. E. Longnecker
Tulsa, University of
Tulsa, Oklahoma (1953)
President J. Paschal Twyman

Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee (1970)
Chancellor Alexander Heard

Virginia Commonwealth
University
Richmond, Virginia (1971)
President Warren W. Brandt

Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan (1929)
President William Rea Keast

Western New England College
Springfield, Massachusetts
(1969)
President Beaumont A. Herman

Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas (1927)
President Clark Ahlberg

Wisconsin, University of
Madison, Wisconsin (1960)
President John C. Weaver
Chancellor J. Martin Klotsche
(Milwaukee Campus)

Wright State University
Dayton, Ohio (1969)
President Brage Golding

Xavier University
Cincinnati, Ohio (1951)
President Paul L. O'Conner, S.J.

Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio (1950)
President A. L. Pugsley

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1971-72

President:	Harold L. Enarson President, Cleveland State University
Vice President:	John P. Raynor, S.J. President, Marquette University
Secretary-Treasurer:	Robert H. Spiro President, Jacksonville University

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1970-71

President:	Lloyd H. Elliott President, George Washington University
Vice President:	Kirk E. Naylor President, University of Nebraska at Omaha
Secretary-Treasurer:	Robert H. Spiro President, Jacksonville University

COMMITTEES — 1970-71

AUDITING COMMITTEE:

President Woodrow M. Strickler, Chairman
University of Louisville

Chancellor Talman W. Van Arsdale, Jr.
Bradley University

NOMINATING COMMITTEE:

Chancellor J. Martin Klotsche, Chairman
University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee Campus)

President Raymond A. Roesche, S. M.
University of Dayton

President Henry King Stanford
University of Miami

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE:

President Malcolm Carron, S. J., Chairman
University of Detroit

President Harold P. Rodes
General Motors Institute

President Gregory Baker Wolfe
Portland State University

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ASSOCIATION ON THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING

J. Martin Klotsche (1972)
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Talman W. Van Arsdale, Jr. (1972)
Bradley University

*Lloyd H. Elliott (1973)
George Washington University

*Phillip G. Hoffman (1973)
University of Houston

Harold L. Enarson (1974)
Cleveland State University

Robert H. Spiro (1974)
Jacksonville University

*Appointed by the Executive Committee January 16, 1970.

PROGRAM

Sunday, November 7, 1971

2:00 p.m. — **Registration:** First Floor Foyer, Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel.

3:00 p.m. — **Bus Tour:** The University of Illinois, Chicago Circle Campus.

6:00 p.m. — **Annual Reception:** Regency Room, Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel. Dr. and Mrs. Norman A. Parker, hosts.

7:00 p.m. — **Dinner and Evening Session:** Embassy Room, Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel. President Lloyd H. Elliott, President of the Association, presiding.
Welcoming Remarks: Norman A. Parker, Vice President for Public Service, University of Illinois.
Address: "An Arrogant Approach to Budget Cutting". David G. Brown, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, Miami University (Ohio).

Monday, November 8, 1971

7:30 a.m. — **Registration:** First Floor Foyer, Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel.

8:00 a.m. — **Group Breakfast Sessions:**
Coordinator of Discussion Topics: J. Osborn Fuller, President, Fairleigh Dickinson University.

Group I
Discussion Leader: Paul A. Miller, President, Rochester Institute of Technology.
Recorder: Robert D. Bell, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor, Long Island University.

Group II
Discussion Leader: T. W. Van Arsdale, Jr., Chancellor, Bradley University.
Recorder: Robert W. French, Assistant to the President, University of Alabama, Birmingham.

Group III
Discussion Leader: Raymond A. Roesch, S.M., President, University of Dayton.
Recorder: A. L. Pugsley, President, Youngstown State University.

General Session

10:00 a.m. — **Business Session:** Embassy Room, Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel. Lloyd H. Elliott, President of the Association, presiding.
Introduction of Visitors
Membership Applications
Report of the Secretary-Treasurer, Robert H. Spiro
Reports of Committees
Auditing — Woodrow M. Strickler
Nominating — J. Martin Klotsche
Resolutions — Malcolm Carron
Election of Officers
New Business

11:15 a.m. — **Reports of Recorders on Breakfast Sessions Discussions:**
Robert D. Bell
Robert W. French
A. L. Pugsley
Discussion

12:15 p.m. — **Luncheon Session:** Hubbard Room, Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel. Lloyd H. Elliott, President of the Association, presiding.
Address: "Higher Education and the Washington Scene". Peter P. Muirhead, Deputy U. S. Commissioner of Education, Office of Education.

2:15 p.m. — **Adjournment.**

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS
DINNER AND EVENING SESSION
Sunday, November 7, 1971

The first session of the 57th annual meeting of the Association of Urban Universities was held in the Embassy Room of the Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel, Chicago, Illinois. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m., Sunday, November 7, 1971, by President Lloyd H. Elliott, President of the Association, presiding.

President Lloyd H. Elliott: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to another annual meeting of the Association of Urban Universities. I want to thank again Norm Parker and at this point thank also the quarterback of that team, Mrs. Parker, for our most interesting and informative and educational and weather-conditioning tour this afternoon. Would both of you stand, please? *(Applause)*

If you haven't met our hard-working, efficient, generalissimo of the Association yet — I refer of course to the secretary-treasurer, money man, record man, working man Bob Spiro, president of Jacksonville University — you should. Bob. *(Applause).* And let me introduce the two people who do the work for which Bob takes the credit. Miss Jarrell. *(Applause)* And Mr. Flowers. *(Applause)*

I don't know what your problems are back home, but two of mine, whether I'm home or some place else can be found in the following: how to get some new money, and how to make the diminishing supply of the old go a little further. If you don't have that problem, congratulations. I haven't met any university people yet who don't have it, but if there are some I'm looking for them, and hope they will retire so I can get their job.

Our speaker tonight has done more than the usual amount of sweating over this. He has gone so far as to put some of his thoughts on paper, and they are very helpful, because I've read them. And they are somewhat controversial too. Any time that you propose to cut back to balance the budget, I assume you are going to get in the controversy.

David Brown is an economist. I told him as we had dinner here that I assumed he was one of those two-handed or two-armed economists, and he said, "What do you mean by that?" I said, "Well, the economist in explaining a problem always says, 'Now on the one hand you have this, and on the other hand . . . and that's the reason the market goes as it goes or stops as it stops." He said "Yes, I'm a two-handed economist." So I guess in the university you have this, and on the other hand you have that. Well we have both of them, David.

David is an economist. He is a graduate of Denison — masters and Ph.D. from Princeton in economics — but he comes back home to us tonight, because he was born in Chicago. I don't know if it was a cold night like tonight or not, David, but we're happy that you were willing to come over from Miami University of Ohio where you serve as academic vice president, to talk to us on a most intriguing topic, one which I suspect we are somewhate guilty of ourselves, because you can't live in this business of budget making without taking what David has called an *arrogant* approach to budget cutting. Dr. David Brown. *(Applause)*

Dr. David Brown: This is something I have looked forward to doing very much. I had a little more time to prepare these remarks than I normally have because of our budget cutting, which prevented a trip to Luxemburg that I had planned.

I'd like to take a very different approach. I was explaining to Lloyd as we were eating that there are very few things that this is an optimally sized group to do. If you're going to address some remarks that are better put in a journal paper that's a one-to-one relationship, and if you're talking to a group like the American Council on Education meetings, where there are 200 people, that's obviously an address kind of situation where you worry about very flowery speeches and all of that. Although I have my remarks written out — they're over there, and you can pick them up afterwards but not before, because I'm not going to follow them that closely — I would like to speak quite informally. I'm going to ask that rather than sitting there each of you pull out a pencil or pen.

I have a little sheet here, and can I get someone to pass around a sheet to everybody? You won't have to work. *(Laughter)* This sheet is called a work sheet, and you'll notice I didn't have the guts back home to call it "An Arrogant Approach to Budget Cutting." It's "New Dollars From Old Budgets" on the written copy. I suggest here that instead of taking notes — and hope that all those of you who are spouses of university administrators will also enter in — the instructions say instead of taking notes on what I'm saying — because it's not worth it — write down what you're thinking: maybe "I have an appointment for breakfast at such and such a time" — that's fine. State your agreement or disagreement with some of the things I'm saying. Record an example that confirms or denies the point. Cite a point that should have been made but wasn't. Put down a question that has been left in your mind.

My thesis is that you don't want to learn anything from me. What you want to do is have me start you thinking so that you can

learn something from some of the other people at the table, something from some of the other people here. You know as I plead with my students in beginning economics courses, "you're going to get as much out of this as you put into it." And I would suggest that that's very much the case here. You're going to have to write some stuff down, and at the end, rather than asking and answering questions, I'm going to ask each table to come up with either an observation of agreement or disagreement or a question based upon some of the things you have jotted down on your piece of paper.

Specifically what I'm going to talk about is how to cut the budget. My remarks are divided into three areas: why do you have to cut the budget — that's obvious in some instances — that's the short portion; how you do it; and how do you identify those areas that are of lowest priority away from which you can switch budget dollars to areas of highest priority, which are easy to identify. Now, that's the bark.

First, why cut the budget? Why bother?

It's obvious to us, but I think that I might share some language. My $10,000 assistant moved in August to a larger house — $500 more rent per year. His salary is frozen. (If it weren't frozen we don't have any money from the legislature, he wouldn't get his increase anyway.) But he's committed to $500 more expenditure and was previously spending all his dollars. His is the problem of the stable state. Either he's got to buy fewer books, eat steak less often (like once a year), or he has to go into debt. Now most of you will see the predicament of my assistant in your institution: expenditures and commitments above the ability to spend.

This is a new era, and it's an era when new programs must be financed by dollars taken away from programs we've had before. This is strikingly different from the last two decades where we have financed new programs out of additional dollars. Most of us have done it by the following mechanism: we had 1,000 students we went to 1,100 (any remarks can be put under "stable state concept" until I get on). One thousand students cost us $3,000 average per student to educate. The additional 100 only cost us $1000 to educate — marginal dollars for the additional 100 — but we charged, or we got subsidy for, depending upon our method of financing, $3000 for each of those additional 100 students, so we got $2,000 extra by expanding per student. But now expansion is no longer as feasible because we're losing, and the

increased sales when you're losing money on each student just means your deficit grows larger.

Now that the problems of managing very large institutions are becoming even more obvious than the problems of financing medium sized ones, now that the birth rate pressure on college enrollment promises temporarily to slacken, now that the student culture is beginning to question the value of a college education, now that the great reservoir of college students seeking arts and science kinds of college education has dried up, we are being faced with limiting our enrollments, and the old game of gaining the difference between the marginal and the average cost to figure a program of adequate expansion is no longer a game that we can play.

In the past we could pay for new programs by growing bigger. Now as demographic and societal forces converge, they compel a stable state, and we must foster institutional renewal by no augmentation without augmentation of resources. The old tricks won't work, it says here. When we said in the past, "let's do it if we can find some outside financing," we meant just that. But now we're saying, "let's not do it."

In the past we could be assured that enrollment growth would insure the hiring of new faculty, new minds, new thoughts, and therefore institutional renewal. Now we face the consequences of growing older together.

We just made a study at Miami, and if we continue our current policies of tenure, retirement, and replacement, by the year 2000 the average age of our faculty will be 57. The average age of our faculty now is 42. That suggests that we need to think differently. It suggests that we are in a new era.

It's as if we started with a wine rack — that's an elegant way to put it — and there were 48 empty stalls. Suppose we went around and collected wine from all over the world; when we collected a bottle of wine we put it in one of the stalls. Before, all we had to decide was can we afford the wine, is there room in the rack. And there was always room in the rack. But now we've filled up the rack. No more enrollment expansion, no more expansion in the capacity for more wine bottles, and we've got to make two decisions every time we make a decision: first of all, how good is the wine we're buying, and secondly, is it better than the one we've already got, because we've got to throw away the other, assuming we can't drink it. There are two decisions, comparative decisions.

That's an era that we haven't lived in in the last twenty years. We've lived in it before in higher education but not in the last twenty years. So the stable state — my basic point is — the stable state is a new era. I'll come back to that, because it's an awfully important point as we relate to our faculties.

What I'd like to do is answer two questions, now that I've talked about the stable state concept: what present resources can be reallocated, and secondly how does it get carried off? Some of you have seen the Minnesota experience. I have here copies for all of you of a 22-page document called "Accountability and Educational Criteria, University Planning for Selective Growth." This I think is one of the best plans for budget reallocation that I have seen. You'll be interested to take this back and look through it in detail. I'll explain it only very briefly, sort of as an overview, before going into some more detailed remarks.

The University of Minnesota's strategy for the stable state rests on two concepts. First, there is a firm faith in educational research and development. To invest three percent of the university's instructional budget in educational R and D is absolutely essential for the institution to remain vital. Second, the responsibility for academic decisions is shared among three levels: the department, the college, and the central administration. Minnesota has asked each department to submit a budget — November 1st it is due, and I called Jerry Shepard just the day before yesterday and he said they are in, most of them — a budget containing only 94 percent of the previous budget the department had. Each decision-making unit was urged to ask for a portion of its budget cut back. Each department could ask for a 40 percent rebate on the dollars it cut, each college an additional 40 percent, and central administration kept 20 percent for thinking up the plan. *(Laughter)*

The philosophy of the Minnesota plan is that the department should have primary and nearly final say as to where a portion of the funds should be reallocated. The department should get a payoff for doing the cutting. Thus, the department is more or less assured of getting its 40 percent rebate. But, to qualify for the rebate a department must state its intended use of the funds and must answer over 50 questions. They are all specified in here. Some of the examples are: can the department reduce the variety of its lower division offerings by consolidation and reorganization of two or more courses? Has the program developed novel and more effective ways of offering introductory courses that make them significantly different from similar offerings elsewhere in the area of the state? Is the program central to the teaching and in-

quiry mission of the university? Has the department introduced any programatic innovations in the last five years? Has the faculty utilized the opportunities for renewal offered by the single quarter leave or sabbatical plan? Can the productivity of a program at a given certificate or degree level be expected to decrease because of duplication elsewhere in the state system? Is the program so highly specialized that it serves only small numbers of students? These are somewhat loaded questions, but the department has to answer them to get their 40 percent rebate back. It doesn't really matter what they say, but they have to answer the questions. Also, the proposal must include a guarantee of adequate consultation with students and departmental faculty, not just the department chairman, an explanation of how the proposed expenditures relate to the primary objectives of the department, thus a long-range plan is required, and a statement on the feasibility of continuing the program following the period of the grant.

The same procedure occurs at the college level and at the vice-presidential level. If the department fails to use its entire rebate, then the college may reallocate to other departments within the college. If a department finds its allocation inadequate, it may request a grant from the all-college or all-university funds. Thus it's really not a budget-cutting technique, it's a budget-reallocating technique.

Departments are assured in advance that they will be given authority to reallocate approximately 40¢ on every dollar located. Often 40¢ placed with full discretion will be preferred by the department to the full dollar that is being spent to fulfill a now low priority need. Moreover the department has an opportunity, by winning the competition at the college and university level, to get not only the 60¢ back that it cut from its budget but also a portion of the 60¢ that was cut by the other departments or the other colleges.

Now, the other plan that I will cite for you — and you'll be able to follow up on the Minnesota way — the other plan is the plan followed by Princeton. I have chosen these two plans because they have the most visibility. There are lots of plans like them, and there are some more brutal plans like the N.Y.U. plan.

At Princeton a faculty-administrative-student committee of the Princeton Community Senate — a committee that includes the head financial officer and academic administrators and is a standing committee within the governmental structure — offers advice to the president.

Princeton was faced with a $2.4 million deficit. The provost conned the committee into agreeing to sending out a next year's budget guideline memo to all department chairmen that was a hold-the-line budget guideline. Department chairmen were asked to propose no net increases in academic or other staff, to reexamine all present vacancies to determine whether they could remain unfilled without jeopardizing essential functions, to propose operating expense budgets no larger than those approved for the current year, and thereby absorb inflationary cost increases, and not to plan to shift charges currently paid from sponsored research to the general budget. Now after issuing these hold-the-line guidelines, the committee went to work searching for places to reduce expenditures and increase income. The topics of faculty and staff housing, tuition, faculty-student ratio, the computer center, dormitory and food services, the library, the operation and maintenance of the physical plant, undergraduate student aid, graduate student support, rents on graduate student housing, special academic programs, athletics, academic administration, general administration, and the faculty and staff salary pools were in October scheduled for discussion, each at a specific future meeting during the year. General principles, such as, "It is far better for a university to do a small number of things well than to accept a general reduction in the overall quality of the educational program, were identified. Subcommittees in each program area, sessions with the head of the program under review, and statements from these heads as to what they would do if they got a 10 percent zap were pursued. All this activity led to reduction of expenditures by $1 million. Primary cuts: computer, graduate student assistants, physical plant, athletics, publications. The committee is meeting again this year and doing the hard thing, cutting academic programs.

Princeton's approach, courageous, probably to be preferred when minor budget cuts are necessary. Minnesota's approach, less disruptive, probably better in the long run, by my judgment.

So much for the two overall examples. I see some of you aren't writing anything down — an officer of our organization not writing anything down. Here, do you need a pencil? **(Laughter)** Well, so much for the overall examples. Now, let's look at some of the specifics, some of the components of reallocation.

Really, all of the plans I have looked at — and I've looked at over 20 plans — seem to mix and match six basic strategies. The moratorium, such as the no new Ph.D. programs moratorium in the State of New York. Second, the freeze, such as no equipment purchases, no maintenance expenditures, no rehiring in the vacancies

left by faculty resignations, or secretarial pregnacies. Third, the across the board cut, such as by holding the line on all salaries at last year's level, or reducing every line item in the budget by five percent. Fourth, an across the board cut that is modified — I call it the modified across the board cut — such as holding an academic department, like the Minnesota plan, to the same expense level but allowing it to shift money from salaries of personnel to other expenses or shift money within the other expense category, however you might label the categories. They can shift around, but they've got ot cut. They don't have to cut each line item though. Fifth, the categorical cut, such as no out of state travel, in a state institution. Or release all non-tenured faculty, which was almost what NYU did. Or decrease paper consumption by 10 percent. And sixth, the program cut, such as closing the school of divinity, which I painfully went through at Drake. Or closing down a school of dentistry, or dropping a Ph.D. program in nuclear physics as at M.I.T. Discontinuing an intercollegiate sport — Buffalo.

Those are the six basic techniques. Now each technique has value, each has limits. It's "the other" and "the other" kind of thing. The moratorium and the freeze have the advantage of easy implementation, immediate cost effectiveness — you can capture dollars immediately — and a strange impersonal equality of treatment of all programs in all categories. You don't have to justify anything. Because the moratorium discriminates uniquely against new programs and crushes, absolutely crushes, the possibility and motivation to adjust to changing times, by my standards, the freeze is a better way to generate many dollars fast than the moratorium.

Now across the board cutting can also be pursued quickly and with the same strange kind of equality in treatment. The undesired effects of cuts will generally be felt less if each spending unit is allowed discretion to redistribute funds within its accounts; thus the modified is better than the pure across the board cutting. A good example for this is a family may want to spend 60% of its budget on meat, if its budget is $100 a week. But when total food expenditures are restricted to $25 a family may wish to spend only 20% of its budget on meat. Similarly, the department or college will likely want to redistribute its funds among its accounts when major changes in budget levels are necessary.

The categorical and program approaches are used when major dollars must be found. As a rule of thumb, institutions that must actually reduce expenditures rather than maintain the same level of expenditures or increase expenditures only modestly have turned to these techniques in the belief that it is better to discontinue

complete programs in order to preserve selective excellence than to hamstring all programs with totally inadquate expenditure limits. For example, in 1971 — these are examples of categorical cuts, typically — Middle Tennessee State University instituted a 20% reduction in budget of all departments for supplies and equipment. (That's categorical rather than programmed.) The State University College of Arts and Sciences at Oneonta, N.Y., cut all organized research. Western Washington State College delayed construction on a housing project. (This is by far the most typical thing that's done categorically.) Southern Louisiana slashed expenditures for new equipment.

Most categorical cuts — and this, I think, is an important point — have unforeseen but very specific differential and discriminatory effects — most categorical cuts. For example, no more equipment purchasing hurts political science very little but biology very much. The release of all non-tenured faculty usually hits an English department much harder than a music department. The prohibition on faculty travel affects the aggressive and nationally prominent faculty much harder. Because the categorical cuts have these unforeseen and discriminatory effects, and because the categorical cuts tend toward hamstringing, like unmodified across the board cuts, my preference is for clean decisions on the suspension of entire academic programs, or entire non-academic programs preferably.

Now, so much for the techniques. A second category, which you also have on your boxes — I see that some of you are starting to scribble, but I do see some people that don't have anything down — O.K. — a second component of the reallocation strategy is who do you hang it on? Who do you hang the initial proposal as to who's going to get zapped on? And there are four choices, besides the ex-president and the ex-provost. The spending unit itself, such as in the Minnesota plan, where each department offers its own budget. Choice two, an agency above the spending unit, such as a college-wide determination of where a department should cut, or a dean cutting the department, or a president cutting the academic area. Third, an internal task force of persons outside the decision hierarchy, the so-called impartial faculty-administrative-student committee. That's the approach we are taking at Miami, and incidentally I have the memo available for you over there in blue, in terms of the memo that I conned the president into sending on this. Fourth, an outside consultant. My bias is preferably a person not from an outside consulting firm, because they are overly expensive for what you get, preferably a colleague you know who's not known locally, and not likely to return. **(Laughter)**

Now, each of these agencies has values and limits. As a rule of thumb, the better part of wisdom is for the president or a higher administrative unit to set general goals, such as the dollar amount that must be found for reallocation, and to charge the unit itself with detailing the implementation. When big dollars must be found, decisions must be made to eliminate selectively the spending units themselves. These are decisions which require either the advice of an internal committee or an outside consultant.

So, we have looked both at techniques and what I call agencies — who bells the cat? I have noticed that in all the plans I have looked at, there are nine common elements. Thus you see the nine common elements on the outline. Regardless of the techniques chosen or the agencies selected, all the strategies seem to have these elements:

1) The alarm is sounded — I can't underline this enough. The crisis is made credible. Professors and deans are by now immunized to presidential poor-mouthing, to the annual plea for restraint, to the periodic declaration of bankruptcy. There has been too much crying of "Wolf, wolf." If the faculty are to risk their own time and their own necks by giving good advice on where the lowest priority dollars are, they must be persuaded that the current crisis is different and persistent, different and continuing, not a one-year aberration. They must become aware of the new need for mechanisms of self-renewal in an era which is the stable state era. A convincing presentation of the discreet break with history, with the history of the past two decades, is a prerequisite to getting the job done. A lot of people miss this step. It usually means sharing more financial data with the community than has been historically the case.

2) The scope of the task is defined at the outset, usually by the president. Minnesota set a percent of budget goal and settled on a set of questions. Princeton defined its goal as removing the deficit. Citing examples of programs to be re-examined and specifying dollars needed for renewal are other means of defining the boundaries of the task.

3) The limits of displacement are also stated at the outset — the limits of displacement. For example, faculty are assured that adjustments will be gradual, through retirement and resignation, not by firing present staff, if that is possible. For example, the community is asked to reduce staff by the number of positions already frozen. This is a good psychological thing to do with a freeze. You freeze it, and then people learn that they

can live with the freeze, and then you say, "O.K., let's reallocate it." People know the limits of the displacement. Princeton adopted the principle that, "We must pay special attention to the considerations of equity and fairness to individuals." Limiting the displacement. At Miami my boss is viewed as the ultimate humanitarian, and we really don't have to make any assurances. People just know that they aren't going to get zapped by Phil Shriver, and if you are that kind of president that's sufficient assurance. There's an assurance of the limits of displacement.

4) The payoffs are obvious. For example, a department, like in the Minnesota plan, is promised that it may reallocate a portion of the new dollars it finds in the old budgets. Emphasis is centered on what can be done with the dollars that are found rather than what must be sacrificed, and if the budget must be cut — and the Minnesota budget actually was cut ½% — you reallocate more than the amount necessary to be cut, so that you have something new you can do.

5) Wide consultation occurs prior to making the decision. Especially, the American sense of fair play demands a full hearing of those most likely to be zapped. That's important, and it's in all the plans. If you're going to zap a guy, the campus won't accept it unless that guy gets a chance for a special pleading. At Drake, for instance, we had a senate meeting where the whole divinity faculty defended the maintenance of the divinity school before the rest of the faculty. The divinity faculty was seven strong. The vote was something like 230 to nine, including the seven, but they had their chance. That's important.

6) Deadlines are set. Reallocation proceedings are anxiety ridden; they are filled with anxieties, and it's important to get the job over with. And that means setting specific deadlines.

7) The president, or the board, accepts the responsibility for the final decisions on reallocation. These are not delegated decisions. No matter who's belling the cat originally, the guy who makes the final decision has to be the president or someone above the president. Committees advise, presidents decide. The final decision-maker simply needs to be relatively far away from the people most affected, but knowledgeable of these effects. He needs to be truly objective. Just as advice must be solicited from persons most closely affected, the decision responsibility must be at the top.

8) Reallocation proposals are quite specific. Reallocations are stated in terms as specific as what lines will be cut in which budgets. Examples are: eliminate the undergraduate major in Russian studies, close two dining halls, hold only one commencement, discontinue an alumni publication. A rather comprehensive list of specific recommendations has been drawn together and issued by the academy for Educational Development. If you haven't seen this I would urge that you get a copy of it. There are 329 recommendations. I have a copy in my briefcase, if anybody wants to look at it. It's a good starting point. They have collected what a number of different universities have done to cut their budgets.

9) Reallocation recommendations are developed against a set of standard questions, as Minnesota, or a standard principles objectives, as the Princeton plan.

Those are the nine things, the nine common elements that I have seen in this over twenty grouping of plans.

I have only one last list to serve as catalyst for what you're going to be at in a minute, and that's the hardest list of all to put together, which is where. Where are the low priority dollars? I have my hunches about Miami, you have your hunches about your own institution, but there are some things that each of us — some frames of mind, some kinds of questions, some types of principles — each of us I think is well advised to look at. And as I looked at these plans, these plans looked at these things.

1) We must insist on comparative judgments. In an expansion era, it is realistic to think environmental studies versus no environmental studies. In an expansion era it's realistic to think that way. Are we better off with an environmental studies program or are we not? In an expansion era, are we better off with a physics program or are we not? But in an era where there are no new dollars, we've got to ask the question, are we better off with an environmental studies program or with a physics program? You're going to be better off with either, you're going to be better off with both, but which one are you going to be better off with if you can only have one, because having half of each isn't a good option. That's got to be a standard way of thinking. That is a presidential way of thinking, but it's not a faculty committee way of thinking. And it's often not a departmental chairman way of thinking. So, that's got to be throughout the system. The habit of thinking trade-offs and opportunity costs — the old economist coming through — needs cultivation.

2) We need to identify the next best alternative. Now when my favorite gas station closed down in Oxford — and it sold 29¢ per gallon gas — I didn't stop driving. That wasn't the option. Instead I bought gas at the next cheapest station for 31¢. Similarly, closing out a program in economics does not mean no college for the 50 economics majors; it means the marginal difference between majoring in economics versus majoring in the field closest to it, like political science. The real cost of not employing a tenured economist to teach economics is not loss of his services, as the advocates for the program would make you believe, instead it's the difference in his contribution as a professor of economics and his contribution at his next best alternative employment, such as teaching economic history in the his ory department. We must look at the substitute goods. If closing down a gas station is going to cost driving, we're never going to close it down. But if it's only going to cost a 2¢ differential, because we're looking at the best alternative, it becomes another ball game.

3) This is the obvious one. We must relate the programs to the goals toward which the university aspires. Flying may be the fastest route to Cincinnati, but if you're headed from here to the Chicago Public Library you should consider other means of transportation. Keeping your destination in mind is an obvious prerequisite in making all judgments. Often the objectives of an institution are obvious from the places it has already invested time, effort, and dollars. Sometimes you don't have to get a statement of objectives, you can just see where the dollars have been put, and you know what the university's objectives are.

4) This is an important one, and it's governing my thinking at Miami. It's governing Princeton's choices, and it's two out of the seven criteria in the Minnesota plan. Reinforce distinctive strengths. Each of us must look carefully to our strengths, to those several programs among our many that are among the best in the nation, or the best in the state, to the distinctive aspects of our environment, to the opportunities that are uniquely ours to explore. I have an analogy for this one too. Like the wise owner of a specialty dress shop who might develop an already existing reputation for avant-garde clothes or for sports wear, or alternately for traditional clothes, we must determine our market and our mission, and we must focus our efforts accordingly.

5) We must consider the people factors. This means asking who is hurt, who is helped, and how, by reallocation.

6) We must think in dollars — think in dollars. That's not very comfortable for one who is a Ph.D. in English. I remember when I made my study of the mobile professors in the faculty marketplace and I sent out a questionnaire characterizing faculty services as a commodity to be traded I got over 200 irate humanists responding "we are not commodities." But we've got to think sometimes in these terms, not because we are commodities, but because that's a convenient concept. And we need to ask questions such as "what are the current costs of a unit of output?" For example, what's the cost of an undergraduate physics major? Most of us don't know that. We know how much we're investing in the physics department, but we don't know what other courses a typical physics major takes. What's the cost of a typical undergraduate physics major? If the program were discontinued — this is a different kind of cost question — if the program were discontinued, how many dollars would be available for reallocation? Sometimes very few; sometimes pitifully few; sometimes more than apparent. What else would the same dollars buy?

7) Apply the same criteria to reallocation as to allocation. The decisions are opposite sides of the same coin.

8) Be consistent and fair, lucky and nimble.

Now, admittedly, I haven't been dealing with a topic that we all relish, but just to cheer you up a little, let me look at the positive side in closing. Historically, the American university has converted each new crisis to the advantage of all, from the meeting of the original call for educating large numbers of students in agriculture to responding to the recent student critiques for more relevant curricula via mass experimentation. We've met problems, and we've converted problems into opportunities. In 1946, and for the 25 years thereafter, American universities were blessed with the problems of over-popularity, of investing new dollars in new plants and programs so rapidly that we didn't even have time to think before we acted. 1970, or the decade of the seventies, marks the end of that era temporarily. Now the opportunity is for enrichment. At last we are being afforded the luxury of thought before action, of contemplation, of evaluation. We are being given some breathing room.

As in the past, most of us in higher education welcome this new challenge, the challenge of adjusting to a stable state after an extended period of rapid growth. Though discontinuing familiar programs will always be painful — oh, how so painful — the challenge of self-renewal without the crush of too rapid expansion and the

promise of new programs funded by reallocation — that challenge goads us on. Curiously invigorating in the time of crsis is the cail, "let us come together to protect, preserve, and strengthen what is uniquely ours, that is essential, and we do best." Crises, well handled, may well bring a greater sense of unity. Reallocation can never be made pleasant, but if the entire community is given the opportunity to share the task there can be very clear social gains. *(Applause)*

That may be premature, because I'd like you to share what you've written down and to, if you would, come up with a comment, a refutation, get mad, an example, a question, and come back in three minutes. Each table will respond, and you have to determine who your responder will be. And come back. Share what you have on your paper. Be free, be open, share your budget.

Dr. Brown: I understand that representing our table is Norm Parker. Go at it. You have to be restricted to 90 seconds.

Dr. Norman A. Parker: I can say my piece in 30. How would you handle the situation in which the State Board of Higher Education in Illinois has asked each publicly supported institution to name its low priority programs, to the tune of 15% savings in its budget? Then the State Board of Higher Education will make the reallocations among the other state supported institutions on the basis of the quality of their presentations for new programs?

Dr. Brown: That's an easy one. I'd leave Illinois. **(Laughter)** Or maybe I'd rehire back my assistant. Given the unique situation in Illinois with Jim Holderman (incidentally, Jim beat me out for student body president when we were in Denison together, and that guy knows how to run one heck of a political campaign), take that as a point made to which there is no answer. **(Laughter)**

O.K. Here we have some eagers. Good.

Chancellor Warren B. Cheston: I'm not eager, but since you started off with the stable state concept, over at this table we would like to question your basic premise. I think particularly for urban public universities and colleges to agree that we are in a stable state situation is just a death wish. It's quite obvious that we are in a stable state situation if we are treating those who have already benefitted from higher education; there are no more. But we have also created an appetite in a very large group of individuals

in our society whom we now cannot shut off, so we are *not* in a stable state.

I heard Earl Shipe talk the other night, and he suggested that the difference between the amount of money that all the universities and colleges in the United States need over the next decade and what they have actually got on a yearly basis is $1 billion, and that our major job as institutional leaders to convince our constituents that $1 billion additional investment in higher education is a good investment. I realize we have these other problems to talk about, but I think they are minor compared to this other one.

So all we are doing is we are questioning, at this table anyway, the stable state concept. It's turning off a whole segment of society that is not yet concerned with education. Would you like to comment?

Dr. Brown: Yes, I would like to comment on that, because it's a very important comment. My institution currently is a stable state institution, which allows me to be so generalizing in my statement. We are at our enrollment maximum of 1980 — in fact we are 600 over it — and this would not be the situation in most urban universities. I believe two things, however. First of all, before we are going to convince the public that it is worth spending $1 billion more on higher education, we are going to have to purge ourselves of the excesses that naturally occur during a period of very rapid expansion. It's the same kind of problem that the Job Corps had, that O.E.O. had. When you have to spend a lot of money rapidly to meet the demands that society is placing upon you, you as an institution are going to do some things that don't look very good when you look back at them. We're going to have to get rid of those things before we are going to convince the public. Secondly, I would question whether we have the ability, even in expanding enrollment situations, to do what we have done in the past, which is increase the dollar expenditures per student at a rate faster than the price level increase, the real dollar spent per student therefore.

We have been through an expansion period where we have been able to increase the dollars spent per student, and those institutions that are going to be expanding enrollment, I would guess, will get more dollars, but they will not get more dollars per student. That considerably weakens the stable state argument, but I don't think it negates it. Do you want to come back at that?

Unidentified Delegate: I'd like to question that. I don't think you are right there. If you go back, at least on individual institutions,

I think you will find that the real dollar cost per student has not increased over the past twenty years.

Dr. Brown: I looked at — I checked this, because I knew this argument was going to come up, because it's the Achilles heel in the whole presentation. I looked at the AAUP statistics on dollars per student, and this is since 1961 or something like that, when they first came in with their grading scale — was it '61? I think it was farther back than that. And these do show an increase. I don't have the percentage, but there was an increase.

Chancellor Cheston: I think normalized to something like 1945 dollars, though.

Dr. Brown: Well, it dosen't matter what dollars they're normalized to, as long as they're constant dollars.

Dr. John C. Buhner: This table was wondering . . . We agree with your comment that the R and D three percent figure at Minnesota is an excellent guideline, but we thought that perhaps you might have then developed what R and D might have meant. It seemed to us it might have meant more of an emphasis on the technology of the pedagogy of learning. Just one example out of zillions, most of us are beset with the problem of what to do with the foreign language department where the rate of return is on the downgrade, where we have all types of problems — you have built in tenure, you have very difficult enrollment patterns — and it struck many of us that sooner or later we are going to have to separate the teaching of language from the literature of language. And this strikes us as providing a beautiful opportunity for the introduction of technology, particularly in the teaching side. Now, taking that concept across the board, the whole notion of reallocating resources would seem to us to suggest that R and D ought to be a very large investment in technology of learning, not just electronic wizardry, but all types of ways of redoing the teaching process.

Dr. Brown: [**First portion of reply not recorded.**] . . . I used two percent to buy off the problems — I got 28 positions — and I used one to buy off the problem in terms of the cutback, and I used the others to support things that people had always been saying we should do, like in intensive language exposure, which the language department was unwilling to do, except when they found out they wouldn't have summer jobs unless they did it. And then the educational reasons went down the drain, and they did it. As a result of that experiment, they are expanding the Monterey approach sig-

nificantly, such that over at Luxemborg the whole place is being turned over this next summer to exactly that approach. I expect that it will come back to campus the following summer in large scale and probably eventually get into the curriculum. This kind of thing is really, I think, very possible.

Dr. Buhner: You would agree, though, when you do a cost flow, you don't have to do it just in the varying examples like language, political science, economics, what not . . .

Dr. Brown: No. That's the 20 percent central administration and the 40 percent the college does. If the department doesn't propose it, it just doesn't get the money.

Other comments?

Dr. John Breazeale: It seems to me that in the expansionist period, a part of what we did that we don't look with such favor on as we look back about it came as a result of the fact that several factors went into creating new programs. One of these was the needs of society for the output of that program. One of these was the peculiar needs which faculty have, or internal reasons, to create new programs. And the third was the demand of students for the programs. I think a part of the credibility gap, which was resulted in the steady state as far as funding is concerned, has been that the publics which support us have not always perceived the importance of those second two reasons for creating new programs.

Now, if you follow a mechanism which you propose that involves basically the same groups — you are considering priorities and reallocation programs that where active in the first proposal for those new programs, that is faculty groups and student groups, with finally the administrator acting on those recommendations — it seems to me that the reductions which you get will come primarily, again, from faculty interests, from student interests, that they will not, in fact, lessen at all the credibility gap between what the public perceives as the importance of the institution, that they will simply confirm the public view that there was a great deal of fat there to be removed, and maintain, in fact, the pressure to reduce the budgets year after year.

Dr. Brown: You may be right. I do believe that, again, in terms of the Minnesota plan, 20 percent of the reallocation at the central level can be responsive to some of those outside pressures, and meet some of those needs, and obviously that will translate into some of the other programs as well. This is not the only thing

that's going to have to be done to reestablish the confidence of the public in financing higher education. Do you want to come back?

Unidentified Delegate: I have a comment to make, and I guess it's related to the terms you use. You used two terms here: one, "how to cut budgets", and the other, you talked about the "reallocation process". This seems to be an appropriate terminology, and I think it goes further than terminology, but the process where you have a fairly traditional type of institution, where you are going to continue fairly traditional types of patterns . . . But some of us are from urban universities and some of these have been created in pretty traditional ways. I think an urban university really connotes a different type of educational experience, one that we are getting into, particularly in state systems, where we see ourselves, even if we don't ***want*** to be forced into in order to justify our existence, or justify equality ***vis-a-vis*** the more traditional schools. Why aren't we speaking in terms of generating budgets, generating priorities, rather than reallocating?

You put particular emphasis on the department, used in the Minnesota situation, but it seems to me that a process of that nature may well thwart what we are trying to do. Departments simply have too much of a vested interest, often, in ways that they want to go about accomplishing their mission.

Someone up here mentioned the modern languages. Well, one of the issues, it seems to me, that confronts us all is the area of modern languages. We're teaching basic Spanish, French, and so forth and doing a pretty good job. If we have to give up a department, physics program, a biochemistry type of area or quality in that area, in order to teach modern languages, why don't we go ahead and make a determination initially in creating budget, establishing priorities, and, one, a structure, which probably would eliminate some of the departmental authority in this area, that may determine, say, that we're not going to teach modern languages any more given the alternatives that we have to give up, that we're going to create from the beginning, generate our priorities rather than reallocate them or to cut budgets.

Dr. Brown: Very good comment. I would like to piggy-back on that.

If you don't feel that you're into the steady state (I like steady state better than stable state) yet, it seems to me that there are a number of things that you should do. First of all, you make all

administrative appointments for five years, reviewable, including the president. Secondly, you have strings attached to many of the programatic funds you put out. You put them out discreetly for three years, or you put them discreetly out for five years, or discreetly for two years, with the understanding that there will be a rejustification, and that there should be a planning for a point at which it could be discontinued without killing the students if it were discontinued. Third, you do need to structure questions such as you suggest, such as what is the next best alternative, including those alternatives outside the institution. In an urban setting there are tremendous opportunities for trading.

I was at a pricing conference out at Berkeley this summer, and we were talking about the absence of internal pricing. We have a very expensive audio-visual service. If we were in an urban setting, it would make great sense to buy those services commercially and not have our own non-priced free good within our structure.

There are a lot of services that universities have traditionally bought from themselves — they're almost like the Mormon's economy within an economy — when in fact the university would be much better off, especially from a revitalizing perspective, to draw upon the resources of other institutions, renting the photographic lab or the electron microscope from a nearby firm rather than buying its own. I do think these kinds of renting opportunities are something that can preserve our flexibility if we have that opportunity to expand and extend, which in a mature institution as I am in, we don't have. You do.

President J. Osborn Fuller: I think that several things that have come up around the tables point out this, my main, question in your approach. I don't think it should be simply the Princeton plan.

I heard the Princeton plan (several of us in this room) explained at a conference at Arden House. Many of the institutions at that conference were not Princeton-type institutions. We sat around with our mouths falling open because we hade done that five years ago. So I think that you can't take a single plan and say, "this is the way to approach it." I think right away you ought to think of combinations. The Minnesota plan has some benefit to effect a department reduction, but, as just pointed out, you assume that the department is O.K. to start with. And you've got a way somehow to eliminate some departments, so you have to bring in maybe simultaneously a committee examination. I don't think it's a single operation at all.

Dr. Brown: Agreed, 100 percent. I agree.

President Elliott: I'm not standing up, Dusty, to answer your question, but you go ahead and ask it, and we'll see what response we get.

President Harold P. Rodes: I'll try to make it brief. You mentioned, and certainly I agree, that it is desirable in this matter of budget cutting and reallocation to consider the vested interests of various groups on campus, the faculty, students, the administrative staff, and so forth. In this process do you view the steady state as evolving a tedency to strengthen the faculty organization, whether it be through the AAUP or through some other type of union, to get involved in negotiating these cutbacks and reallocations? Or do you think that this situation weakens it?

Dr. Brown: I think a case can be built either way, and I'm not tempted to build a case either way. I can see when you have new dollars you're going to have people competing for them. The thing that will kill a union fastest is a real financial crunch — I mean a real financial crunch where you've got to cut salaries 30 percent and this type of thing — so that would argue against it increasing. On the other hand, if you are reallocating dollars away from pockets like our English department, which happens to be, voting wise, 26 percent of the faculty, you can figure that they are going to be prone to unionization. And indeed that's where most of our union activity is right now — in those areas that are obviously overstaffed. **(Laughter)** I don't know which way you go. Yes?

Robert L. Randolph: This question has been asked several times before, but as a fellow economist I am a bit confused. It has always been my assumption that either an institution grows or it dies; there's no such thing as a stable state. Isn't that true?

Dr. Brown: Yes, and that's why there must be a reallocation.

Mr. Randolph: Well that's buying the assumption that growth cannot continue.

Dr. Brown: That's making sure that growth continues even if there is not a growth in dollars.

Mr. Randolph: That's another assumption — if.

Dr. Brown: Well, yes. It's easy to continue growth if you have

a growth in dollars. You can just add new programs with new dollars. If you don't have the new dollars, you also have a need for remaining vital, and there are at least a lot of . . . maybe there isn't another institution in the room except mine that feels the need of working out some mechanism of retaining the ability to grow because we do not expect large influxes of marginal dollars, at least not as large as in the past two decades. And if there is none, God bless you, I'm all for it. But if there is the reality of not large marginal dollars, what I'm saying is self-renewal is still essential, and we've got to develop mechanisms to generate that self-renewal. Ideally, let's go out and get more money. I assume that we've done that; if we haven't done that ringing the bell for the crisis isn't going to work, because academic vice presidents are going to come back and say, "Mr. President, you aren't doing your job getting the maximum amount of money. I'm not going to help you a bit until you get out and raise some money." That may be a one-time statement, but . . . *(Laughter)*

Chancellor Francis C. Broderick: I think you've given away too much, because even if the dollars were continued, and even if the decade of the seventies were to be a repetition of the decade of the sixties in growth, this kind of reevaluation should continue in any case. Even if you were to grow at your place as much in the seventies as in the sixties, you have no business continuing with 26 percent of your faculty in the English department. So it seems to me that you gave away too much in that answer.

Dr. Brown: I like to end having given away too much. *(Laughter)*
President Elliott: Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

There are copies of these three documents available for everyone in the room, and I'm sure you will read them with great interest after Dr. Brown's evening with us. I can't help but editorialize for one moment on the discussion of the evening. I like some of the language which David Brown has used, but when he talks about being zapped . . . *(Laughter)*

Dr. Brown: You'll not find that word in the printed text.

President Elliott: I think it's quite descriptive. I think it so much so that I think the real zapping has been done by the public against the colleges and universities in the last few years, and we're the ones that have been zapped, if you please. I liken that to being caught on the blind side with something that has caught up with you. I have the very strong feeling — I hope no one shares it with me — I have the very strong feeling that we are going through

a period in which we must reestablish our credibility with the American public. And I call it the period of disenchantment, myself.

There are a lot of people disenchanted with what we in our institutions are doing, have been doing, or have not done, or are not doing. And I see a period at least of a few months — it may be a little longer than that — in which we're going to have to reestablish the credibility.

Tonight, if this program works out as we had envisioned, we would do just that, because we'll end up tomorrow noon with Peter Muirhead telling us what's going on in Washington. And there is at least, I say at least, a ray of hope in what's going on in Washington, in spite of what you think about what's going on in Washington. And of course, the latter is gratuitous also.

When I heard Norman Parker say this afternoon that he did not envision a law school at the Chicago Circle Campus of the University of Illinois, I had to think of Washington again where we have more law schools than nearly anything else. All of them are crowded, and all of them are growing, and there are more lawyers per square inch in Washington than any place else in the world. And there's still more room for more, because the confusion expands far faster than the lawyers can reduce it. *(Laughter)* There's a future there. Well, Peter Muirhead is going to bring us that analysis tomorrow noon.

Ladies and gentlemen, an announcement or two. Our breakfast sessions for, should I say, the working members of the Association (now, that's a dangerous statement), will begin at 8 o'clock, and I think we have some subject matter with which to deal. For the wives, or I should say maybe spouses, I will say a certain number of the ladies, the day will begin at 9 o'clock by meeting Mrs. Parker in the lobby. And, if you have appropriate willpower, you will go to Marshall Field's at 9:45, and if you don't have any willpower you will stay there the rest of the day. Others will come back on the bus, which will bring you back to the hotel. Checkout time tomorrow is 3 o'clock, so everyone should have enough time at the hotel, and with that, unless there is one additional gem for cutting one more budget, we will adjourn for tonight. Thank you.

GENERAL AND BUSINESS SESSIONS

Monday, November 8, 1971

The general and business sessions of the annual meeting were held in the Embassy Room of the Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel, Chicago, Illinois. The general session was called to order at 10:00 a.m., Monday, November 8, 1971, by President Lloyd H. Elliott, President of the Association, presiding.

President Elliott: Ladies and gentlemen, I have a few details which will be of interest to you, and our business session should get you out in time to go back and put your dirty socks in the suitcase before lunch. Miss Jarrell has checked with the hotel, and in spite of protests, which are common these days, she has the assurance that AUU people will be allowed until 3 o'clock to check out. If anybody starts fussing with you, identify yourself as a member of the AUU group — and then you'll be more unpopular, but you'll get to stay. *(Laughter)*

I would like to introduce Mr. Donald Draine from the Minnesota Coordinating Commission on Higher Education. Is he with us this morning? Nice to have you. *(Applause)*

Now there are two people who are very much with it and with us, but their names are not on the list, and I want to make sure that you meet them — I think most of you have — but Francis Broderick, Chancellor of the University of Massachusetts in Boston — where are you, Frank? Thank you. Sorry we missed you on the list. And Henry Saltzman, President of Pratt Institute. And we have Ralph Carnes — Mr. and Mrs., that is — from Roosevelt University here in the city of Chicago. Very nice to have you with us.

This past year did not seem to be, with the economic freezes and squeezes, a propitious year for aggressive campaigns to increase the membership of this Association, so the choice of tacit progress was followed. We are happy to have with us today the representatives of four new institutions, whose applications for membership will be duly processed. So far as I know, no reason whatsoever could be found for denying them admission; instead I would like to welcome them to the membership of the Association of Urban Universities and introduce the representatives who are here. From the University of Alabama in Birmingham, Mr. Robert French. Nice to have you, sir. From the University of Colorado, Denver Center of the University of Colorado, Mr. Joe J. Keane. And from Texas Southern University, in Houston, Texas, Mrs.

Hortense Dixon. Mrs. Dixon. And from the Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, Virginia, Mr. Hy Willett.

Our secretary-treasurer will have a more complete report on membership in the Association a little later. And with that, to tell us where we have come and gone in the last year and how rich and affluent the treasury is, and anything else he wishes to say about it, our hard-working secretary-treasurer Bob Spiro. Bob.

President Robert H. Spiro: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to begin my very brief report to you by expressing publicly my appreciation to Miss Marion Jarrell and Mr. George Flowers, who serve on our staff at Jacksonville University and who serve respectively as Assistant Secretary- Treasurer and Director of Publications for the AUU. These very handsome and intelligent young people have done the hard work, and you and I take the glory.

I'd like to give you a short financial statement. The balance of the Association account on 1 November 1970 was $5,455.74. Our receipts during the year have been in the amount of $8,594.77. Our total credits, or income, $14,050.51. Our disbursements — annual meeting, the newsletter, the stipends to the assistant secretary-treasurer and the editor, travel and dues, and miscellaneous — have been $8,166.30.

I'm very pleased to say that this organization, like your own college or university, has a small surplus of operating funds during the current year. Our balance is $5,864.21; a year ago that was $5,455.74, so we had a net increase of about $300.

Our dues are $75 per year. The report has been audited, the very simple balance sheet, and we are pleased that we are in business and solvent.

The membership of the Association has increased during the last two years. I think last year we added thirteen members. This immediate past year we have added four members, as our president has introduced representatives of these institutions today.

Three members have asked to resign from the Association: the University of Hartford, Washington University and Washburn University of Topeka. I have had letters from the presidents or chancellors of these institutions. In each case finances was given as the reason, not lack of interest, not dissatisfaction, nor anything

of that sort. One letter mentioned economies throughout the university: "the tightness of our current budget as we plan for fiscal solvency is such that we have had to effect these economies, and should the situation improve next year we'll rejoin." Another one wrote that "for budgetary reasons we are reviewing all organizational membership dues and have determined that we shall not be able to continue our membership in the Association of Urban Universities." The third indicated that, "we have been in a period of financial retrenchment since the tornado of 1966." (This was not a student-induced tornado, but a bona-fide disturbance of the climate. Washburn University lost 80 percent of its campus, and they are really in a period of retrenchment.) So these three for these financial reasons have asked not to renew their membership.

Two other institutions have not paid their dues for two years, and according to our bylaws they will be dropped from membership: Canisius College and Union. And so our membership held steady as she goes during the past year and now stands at 119 plus 4 — 123 members.

The registration for this meeting: 44 institutions are represented by 58 persons, and there are 25 presidents and chancellors present at the meeting this time.

Many of you have indicated your great satisfaction with the ***Newsletter*** and information that it provides. Mr. George Flowers is our very competent editor, and during the past year he published a winter, spring and summer issue, two issues, and the fall issue is pending. I hope that you found this useful. I have asked several persons here present "do you get it" and "are you reading it?", and the response seems to be very enthusiastic about it. We publish 650 copies of each issue, and Mr. Flowers is now updating the mailing list we inherited from our distinguished predecessor at Bradley, the mailing list and some mailing tabs. We have used these up now, and it will be necessary for us to spend about $80, I understand, to set up our mailing list anew, which prompts me to say that if you have not for any reason been receiving the newsletter, or if there has been a change of address in your institution, Mr. Flowers would like very much to have that information. You may address him or address it to me, and I will forward the information to him, care of Jacksonville University, Jacksonville, Florida 32211, and that will reach us promptly. We receive many requests from libraries who wish to receive the ***Newsletter***

We'd like to request that you notify Mr. Flowers of any change in the leadership of your institution (I'm not referring to student

assumption of power), but if you have a new chancellor or president, new provost, or if you'd like others added to the mailing list, notify Mr. Flowers and he'll be glad to arrange that for you. Some institutions — most — are sending news releases. He has a very heavy correspondence from news bureaus. We'd like to have more pictures. If you have a magnificent new building or other facilities that you'd like publicized, probably we can't use them all, but we would certainly like to have photographic prints as appropriate of persons and facilities on your campus. We hope yo uwill send us this information.

One other request: we would much appreciate having any kinds of management information from presidents, news of reorganizations, economies effected — we've been discussing that with the able assistance last night of Dr. Brown of Miami of Ohio — and if any of you presidents or chancellors or anyone here present today would care to send information to Mr. Flowers about your institution, some of its unique features, new programs added or cut, or other information, we'd be happy to have it, and we would like to give due publicity to your institutions — the member institutions of our body. There are development campaigns, especially in the private institutions, information about legislative budgets — anything that you think would be of interest we would appeal to you to send us, so that this very helpful newsletter can become increasingly meaningful to us. Everybody likes to know what the other fellow is doing and how he fares, and so this will be very helpful to us.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the approval of the financial statement, which has been duly audited. You may wish to comment about it in any manner you so desire. There's a copy of the budget. The Auditing Committee has gone over it and certifies to its accuracy.

President Elliott: Thank you, Mr. Secretary-Treasurer. Before we take action on that, I think it would be in order to have a report of the Auditing Committee. President Strickler of the University of Louisville kindly consented to serve as chairman of that body. President Strickler.

President Woodrow M. Strickler: Mr. Chairman, late yesterday afternoon Chancellor Van Arsdale, in a spirit of genial cooperation, agreed to join with me to serve as the Auditing Committee for this body. At that time then we indulged for a considerable period of time in reviewing materials that were provided to us. We received

the record of receipts, the expense accounts; we checked the bank balances, and we found that everything is in proper order. As Bob indicated a moment ago we noted that receipts for the year amounted to $8,594.77 with expenditures of $8,186.30. The balance for the past year, in consequence, had risen from $5,455.74 to $5,864.21, according to the books, and the bank statement verifies this amount.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the report of the Auditing Committee be accepted at this time.

President Elliott: May I have a second?

Unidentified Delegate: Second.

President Elliott: All in favor please say, "Aye."

The Delegates: Aye.

President Elliott: All opposed. Thank you. Will someone second the previous motion that the Treasurer's report be received?

Unidentified Delegate: Second . . .

President Elliott: All in favor say "Aye."

The Delegates: Aye.

President Elliott: Opposed . . . aren't usually recognized in this body *(Laughter)* so we'll go ahead and invite Bob and his staff to take over the administration of our respective budgets back home any time they want to if they can guarantee similar results.

An important part of this Association is the work of the officers, and I have turned to Joe Klotsche of Milwaukee, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, to serve as chairman of the Nominating Committee. Joe, will you tell us what's up.

Chancellor Martin J. Klotsche: Thank you, Lloyd. Members of the Association, the Nominating Committee has met. The Nominating Committee consists of Henry King Stanford, president of the University of Miami, who was not able to be here at the meeting, but we did communicate with him a week or so prior to the meeting; Father Raymond Roesch, who is president of the University of Dayton, was the other member of the committee, and the

three of us make this report to this Association, proposing the following officers for the coming year for this Associiation.

We propose for president, Harold Enarson, who is president of Cleveland State University; for vice president, Father John Raynor, president of Marquette University; and for secretary-treasurer, our very able continuing secretary, Robert Spiro, president of Jacksonville University.

This is our report, Mr. President, and we submit it to you and to the Association for its consideration.

President Elliott: Are there any nominations from the floor? Speak quickly. Hearing none, I should like a motion accepting the slate of officers as presented by the nominating committee.

Unidentified Delegate: I so move.

President Elliott: Is there a second?

Unidentified Delegate: Second.

President Elliott: All in favor say "Aye."

The Delegates: Aye.

President Elliott: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

This brings us to a report of the Resolutions Committee, and since this Association has not decided through its resolutions to settle the problems of the world, or even take on the problems of Washington, D.C., the Resolutions Committee has usually had something less than an adversarial role. To perform that very, I hope, happy function the president of the University of Detroit, Father Carron, has agreed to serve, and he will report for the committee.

President Malcolm Carron, S.J.: The other members of this committee who didn't have to do any work but get all the glory, are Greg Wolfe and "Dusty" Rodes. We have one simple resolution:

> The Association of Urban Universities expresses its deep and lasting gratitude to Dr. and Mrs. Norman Parker for their hospitality in providing a most interesting tour, and

for the many other courtesies extended to the members and members' spouses during the 57th annual meeting of the Associaition.

I move the adoption of this resolution.

President Elliott: All in favor?

The Delegates: Aye.

President Elliott: Thank you. Thank you, Father Carron.

There are a couple of items of business which I think need to be brought to your attention at this time, and one of them is, I think, obvious today and last evening, and that is a conflict which we ran into in the dates of this meeting. For years I think — I'm precise in putting it that way — for many years, this Association held its annual meeting the first Sunday in November. That has been all the way, of course, from the first day of November to the seventh day. And the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges has held i stmeeting on the second — I will call it weekend — of November, and this year we came head on in conflict. We didn't know their schedule until after ours was already announced, and I think it's fair to say that they didn't check ours either, but we did run into a number of conflicts because a number of our members belong to both groups. If we follow the same pattern and establish the date for the first Sunday and the first Monday in November next year, this conflict will not occur. But I think it is desirable that the new officers of the Association check this and clear it with the land grant association before the date is confirmed, and with your permission that will be my recommendation to Harold Enarson, the incoming president. In the meantime I shall check the two dates when I get back home and give him that information along with the report. I think it would be desirable that we stay clear of that conflict. Yes?

President William Hazell: Another group, the Association of State Colleges and Universities, which is meeting currently, takes a number of our people.

President Elliott: And they are in Denver right now, and that is the second conflict. It would be my recommendation to Dr. Enarson that we avoid both of these, and it may be necessary to reschedule this meeting.

I see in the audience such people as Tom Van Arsdale, Joe

Klotsche, and others whom I shall call veterans of this Association. Am I correct, Norman Parker and others with longer experience than mine, that this Sunday evening-Monday combination we would like to preserve if at all possible. Would you agree with that, that that is a convenient time, following the format of our institutions?

President Parker: I certainly do. My whole experience, of course, has been only with this Sunday evening and Monday meeting and in the past, when we haven't had conflicts, I think it has worked out very well.

President Klotsche: I think the best of both worlds would be one in which we continue to maintain the Sunday evening-Monday and also not have conflicts with the two other association meetings.

Chancellor T. W. Van Arsdale: This is the first time I remember a conflict. I'm surprised that ten years is considered veteran, but I guess it is these days. *(Laughter)*

President Elliott: Ten years I would call old veterans. *(Laughter)* We shall strive to do that then, gentlemen and ladies.

The other item of business is the place of next year's meeting, and while we try to anticipate two or three years ahead, we are successful in most instances but not always. We have an invitation for next year's meeting from our secretary-treasurer to come to Jacksonville. When I got out in the Chicago wind yesterday morning, I was tempted to move it up a year, Bob. This, too, would be a recommendation which I would make on your behalf to the incoming president, Harold Enarson, and unless there are objections, unless there are other invitations to be extended this morning, it would be our recommendation to the incoming officers that we accept Dr. Spiro's invitation to Jacksonville next year. But I'd like to have an expression if there is a different sentiment in the group.

We do rotate this meeting, as you know, from year to year to the many parts of the United States. We don't have any pattern of coming back and forth from Washington or New York or Chicago of that kind. We try to go to the institutions represented by the membership, and, as we had yesterday, take full advantage of what that institution or that setting has to offer in the way of tours, looks at the locale, etc. And with this spirit I must confess Jacksonville looks very attractive to me in early November. I should say Bob Spiro has his own private golf course. He lives on the sixth fairway, and we could meet there for a one o'clock tee-off or what-

ever it is that he has arranged. May I have your expression of your sentiment?

Chancellor Van Arsdale: I move in favor of accepting the invitation.

President Elliott: It's been moved. Second?

Unidentified Delegate: Second.

President Elliott: Any discussion?

Unidentified Delegate: Florida? *(Laughter)* There is a Jacksonville, Illinois, you know.

President Elliott: No, I didn't know that.

Unidentified Delegate: I'm just trying to get it in the motion that it is in Florida. *(Laughter)*

President Elliott: Is there any further discussion? If not, all in favor of the meeting on the sixth tee at Jacksonville next year please say "Aye."

The Delegates: Aye.

President Elliott: Or the tennis court. All opposed? Thank you.

I have one other announcement I would like to make. As a member of the National Commission on Accrediting and as a representative of your Association, I would like to confirm what most of you have already read in the news releases that the National Commission on Accrediting, its executive committee, has voted along with the executive committee of the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education, to merge. These two groups, the National Commission and FRACHE, will present to their respective memberships the opportunity to vote on the merger of the two groups. This has been under discussion for perhaps three or four years and seriously for at least two years, and at a meeting of the two executive committes in joint session here in Chicago just a few weeks ago, the executive committes voted to move in this direction. I would be glad to go into such detail as the membership would like regarding the arguments pro and con on, the issues which seemed to be before these two groups, but I'd rather like to report it here as a development as one of your dele-

gates. The other delegate to that group is Joe Klotsche, and I'll ask Joe if he has anything further to say on it. Are there any questions or comments then regarding it? If not, it would be our guess that the memberships will in due course approve this merger.

Now we come to a report of the breakfast sessions, and as someone has said, we get the benefit of the combined wisdom of this assembly. As one of the recorders said, "any relationship between what I say and what was really discussed will be purely coincidental," but Bob Spiro will take over.

President Spiro: Mr. Chairman, as all of us are well aware, most of our meetings — and we as officers of universities go to a lot of meetings — are very large. We hear a lot of complaint about the sizes of many of our institutions and the impersonalism that seems to result therefrom, and the same obtains with regard to meetings. I am somewhat compelled to go to the annual meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, a meeting, I regret to say, in Miami Beach in about three weeks, and there will be 4,000 delegates and representatives of education at all levels. That meeting is thus extremely large. This is the only national meeting I know that is small, and I think many of us feel that the opportunities for discussion and exchange of ideas are unique. We meet for actually less than 24 hours. We began registration at 2 o'clock yesterday and had a tour and meeting last evening, as all of us know. This meeting has its special virtues, and I believe that the fact of these breakfast sessions enhances much our pleasure and our understanding of our institutions and of others and of what is being done.

Three sessions met this morning. Each one had around 15 or 16 persons present, eqalized very well with three very distinguished leaders, and I would like to call upon the discussion leader to present his reporter, if he himself is not giving the report, and then we'll have some opportunity for discussion of the breakfast sessions and some of the considerations relating to finance and campus life and many other topics that were introduced and discussed today.

I would like to point out that there is a microphone here, and Mr. Flowers is at the console and is recording the discussions, which will be summarized and placed in the transactions of our Association and distributed to you later in the year. No matter how famous you are and how well you know everyone recognizes you, would you mind giving your name as you speak and discuss, so that we shall have the record. I promise you that C.I.A. and F.B.I.,

and the Congressional committees are not involved in this at all. We would simply like to be able to identify those who make comments . . . *(Laughter)*

Paul A. Miller, President of Rochester Institute of Technology, presided at Group 1, and I would like to call on him and any other persons he wishes to involve. President Miller, would you please take the microphone and give us a report of your discussion in Group 1.

President Paul A. Miller: Dr. Spiro, we had an elaborate process of delegation in our committee, which consumed a substantial amount of the morning, and as the outcome of this Dr. Bell of Long Island University was chosen unanimously to be our reporter, and I defer to him.

Dr. Robert D. Bell: I wasn't chosen at all, I was delegated. I reflect the thought of our chairman that it's absolutely impossible for me to try to represent the ideas of sixteen individuals, so I apologize in advance for whatever distortion of their ideas I make.

Interestingly enough our group of sixteen represented an even split of 50-50 between private institutions, allowing for the schizophrenia of the University of Pittsburgh, whether they are public or private. The enrollments generally seemed to fall between 10,000 and 20,000 — head count, not full time equivalents.

We started our discussion by talking about the problems of all of higher education and not really focusing on the urban institution so much as just what are the problems of all higher education and these, obviously, you could write the script, I think. We talked about relevance, we talked about finances, we talked about reallocation of priorities, we talked about identification of new constituencies, we talked about the problems of state legislatures, and it was interesting to me that the problems of the state legislatures were as important to the private institutions as they are to the public insitutions. I think it was Dr. Miller who maybe summed it up and said that our problems perhaps arose out of the fact that we have been too successful in bringing large numbers of students to the universities and that we have been so busy just getting these students in and finding room for them and processing them and trying to provide programs for them, that now we really have to catch up and make ourselves relevant.

Then we got around to talking about urban univeristies, as opposed to all of higher education, and someone observed, I think

quite wisely, that an urban institution is not necessarily an institution in an urban setting. And, therefore, we tried to define what an urban institution is and to discover if an urban institution does have a specific function or role to play.

I think where we ended up we identified each of our institutions in terms of — this is the point where I am interpreting, and I hope I'm interpreting correctly — we're either leaders or we're partners or we're followers; and if we are leaders, in effect we are still the ivory tower institution attracting people to us because we have something distinctive and something special. If we're partners, we are partners in terms of working in the community with the community agencies, with community leaders, and if we're partners in the very best sense, we are partners in the sense that we not only are participating in the community and its programs, but that this participation is feeding back into the academic programs of our institutions — that is, we are involving students who are enrolled in courses, and these courses take them into the community and they bring that experience back to the university, back to the institution. And if we are followers this is not necessarily pejorative that maybe we do have to some extent a service function to perform. That is simply we have the personnel and we have the arrangement whereby we can actually provide directly a service to the community and that this is not necessarily a bad thing, although one of our number (I forget who it was) mentioned that the problem arose with the land grant colleges, or at least one of the land grant colleges, that they discovered that they were actually offering — this was back in the misty past — a course in agricultural Greek. He said that we need to be careful not to get to the point where we are offering programs in urban English literature.

I'll sum it up by saying that we do serve in the communities, and some of our members identified specific programs. The University of Pittsburgh is making an extensive effort to provide what they call and inter-face with the community to identify what the problems are and what the community is and what their world is in this total process. President Fuller from Fairleigh Dickinson told about a goodly number of students who are working in programs, I think non-academic, as volunteers in programs from Head Start-type programs up to the point where some universities are functioning as kind of executive assistants to councilmen in the City of Newark. President Saltzman from Pratt described a program where architectural students, design students, were working on community programs as part of their academic training, but this experience was in the community. Representatives from University

of Missouri at Kansas City described a new medical school that is being built with the very distinct feature of being designed to serve the community and, as I understand, its whole rationale is to be a medical school-hospital complex which functions with the urban setting as a background. A gentleman from the University of Delaware described programs where they participated in the reorganization of the whole state government, and they participated in a program of the reorganization of the Wilmington school district. I think it was he who made the point very well that this kind of activity was only worthwhile if it brought the students back to the institution with some experience that they could feed back into other academic programs. And finally the gentleman from the University of South Florida described, interestingly enough it seems to me, that they took advantage of the fact that St. Petersburg was right next door, and the large population of retired people; they have a program in gerontology that uses these people as — well somebody said we shouldn't talk of these people or the community as a laboratory, but I don't think that's necessarily bad. It is a laboratory in the community if you use it in the proper way. If you simply use it as a laboratory and have no real feeling for it, perhaps you're in trouble.

I think that what we really came out with, though, was that we want to be partners in the community, that that's the ideal role for us to play , and that we might measure this by the extent to which we are actually involving our students in academic programs that are serving in the community.

President Spiro: Thank you very much. And now Tom Van Arsdale, Chancellor at Bradley, will give us a report for Group 2.

Chancellor Van Arsdale: I'm not going to give the report, Bob. By acclamation, mostly mine, Bob French of the University of Alabama at Birmingham very kindly agreed to accept the post of recorder, and he will report for our group.

Dr. Robert W. French: I ought to say, I suppose, a personal word because not only is this my first meeting, this is our first meeting as members of this Association. It's an honor to be accepted into this group. The Association is a group that I have known for some time and have been interested in for a good many years. I was looking over your roster of members, and I can understand why I am interested in this group and why we are so happy to be accepted into it. All of the posts that I have been in in higher education now for about 20 or more years have been in the service of members of this Association, and so this (string) is continued now, un-

broken, with the acceptance of the University of Alabama in Birmingham in your midst.

The university is a rather unusual institution. I hope we can make a contribution to your discussions here. I think our experiences have been somewhat unique. As some of you know, the University of Alabama in Birmingham began as an extension center a long time ago — a rather unbalanced extension center. We worked in the graduate levels in education and engineering back in 1935, then some eleven or twelve years later the Alabama legislature passed the necessary bills setting up a school of medicine, a college of medicine, in Birmingham. So first a school of medicine was created then a school of dentistry and then around that the school of nursing moved from Tuscaloosa, a school of optometry, and a school of community and allied health. And so we've had the experience of starting, you see, really heavily in the medical and health areas, whereas some of you, Kansas City, for example, are just beginning, coming in perhaps from a different angle. And that's given us a slant, I think, with respect to these things that perhaps we will be able to draw upon to help you and to help ourselves in the exchange of information here.

The group that I am reporting for was a group that didn't start off, Mr. Bell, with the higher issues; they got down to the nitty-gritty right away. We started picking up on those discussions of last night having to do with the financing.

This is, I suppose, not by way of adding much in the way of illumination to the very fine paper that we had last night, but I'd like to just check off for you some things that I think are a bit old hat, but we need when we look at the problems of financing higher education in these days to keep reminding ourselves of these things. I think four or five things stood out in our discussion. One was there needs to be a clarification of our mission, and so the remarks that were just made concerning what an urban university is, of course, is very pertintent to this point that bears so importantly upon our financing; a definition of our priorities — a thing that is by no means easy to do; the acceptance and accommodation of prior and extra institutional approval of new programs particularly is something that I know we find a very rigorous exercise at Chicago Circle and in other places, somewhat in Alabama already, because we have now got a commission on higher education which is just trying to find its way, and it will, and we'll have to accept this as a fact of life too.

Father Baumhart called attention to another thing which I am

very conscious of, and that's the need for greater cooperation among the institutions that find themselves in a common urban setting. And indeed this is one of the charges which the president has placed upon me in Birmingham is to try to effect a higher degree of cooperation among the seven or eight institutions of higher education which are in that city, a rather unique group of institutions I might say — several church-related, black, predominately black junior college, predominantly white junior college, the state university which has this burgeoning medical center, a very important one in the national landscape of medical education, health education, and two church-related schools which are primarily white. So we've got a combination of public and private, junior and senior institutions, a university, a medical center, and all of these things. And how does one effect higher degrees of cooperation among them? Does one do this by the formal means of consortia or more formalized arrangements, or do you seek some other pattern or some mixture? These are some of the things that we are struggling with right now in Birmingham. They have, of course, very important ramifications insofar as financing is concerned.

Father Baumhart also said one other thing to us which struck me, and that is the need to develop some meaningful comparisons between institutions. One of my jobs as director of the office of institutional planning and programs at the University of Alabama is to develop a management data bank, and we are struggling to try to get meaningful statistics just for internal management purposes. But beyond that, of course, if we are going to engage in any kind of fruitful cooperative efforts, we have to have some common denominators by which we can measure the things that we need to measure in order to figure out how we are going to work together more effectively.

So much for those four or five suggestions that have been made before. I have enlarged a little on a couple, the last one particularly, that we did not discuss much last night.

Now, some of us saw some rather positive good in the situation in which we have been plunged by events beyond our control, although for which I think we are in part responsible, in this financial crisis that we face or the lack of support that we find in the community in general for some of the things which we do, and that is that on the positive side the exercise of trying to define the areas that can be cut from what we are doing is a salutary exercise indeed.

I remember a number of years ago in the State of Louisiana that we were challenging the departments of government — a private organization of which I was then the director — as to what they would do in the state government if they were compelled to live with budgets that were 10 or 15 percent less. Norman was talking a little bit about this last night insofar as Illinois is concerned. Well that's a salutary exercise, and I can say that this experience a number of years ago in which a group of private citizens were challenging the heads of state agencies in the state of Louisiana as to what they would do if they had to cut their budget 10 or 15 percent is the kind of exercise in which I think we all now need to be engaged in higher education.

Secondly, on the positive side, Joe noted that the departmental review and justification of what departments are doing was also a thing that could be a blessing, not a curse, something, again, that we all would find very helpful. I am happy to say that there was no wringing of hands in connection with this. I made in my notes that I thought somebody was going to come up with some of the negative aspects of this, but I found rather in our group an accentuation of the positive insofar as our fiscal problems are concerned.

There are some special problems that we noted in connection with this — the inflexibilities that are built into higher education, of course, by tenure and a lot of other things we didn't mention, which I am inclined to believe are more important than the inflexibilities of tenure, that prevent us from shifting or reallocating our resources as we ought to. In view of the circumstances in which we find ourselves, our internal environment, and also, the external environment, constitutes a special problem, I think, in higher education. And then a whole host of uncertainties which beset us or beset the various parts of our institutions with respect to the future — we have to think of facts about population and emphasis and these kinds of things in which the future is by no means clear.

We wound up our consideration of financing by talking about a kind of a budget roundup, and we went around the table and everybody said a few words about his financial situation. To generalize is difficult here except to say that, of course, it's a very mixed picture. We find that some institutions are relatively well off, and I would class our institution in this category. As John Buhner was saying, "we may face in Indiana the moment of truth three or four years down the line." Some institutions very obviously faced the moment of truth long ago, and as one who once served at a private university, Tulane University, as vice president for development

I can say that the private institutions have faced this moment of fiscal truth for a long time, and that doesn't mean that they have surmounted, or come through with the answers. We found in our group, mixed, as Mr. Bell indicated his group was, between public and private institutions, that in some way the private institutions and an institution like Texas Southern have lived hanging on by their fingernails so long to the cliff of financial disaster that they are perhaps more comfortable in it than institutions which have been relatively affluent.

So much then for our comments, my comments, on the financial side. It's a kind of a mixed picture and an interesting one to me, and I'm sure that those who were present there, even though I'm not repeating the detail, found a good many things that they could take home with them that would be of benefit to them.

We spent about the last quarter of our discussion period on the movement toward collective bargaining in higher education, and we were favored with some first-hand reports from the front. Father Carron told us a little bit about what happened just last week at his school, University of Detroit. The effort there is, at least for the moment, as far as the faculty is concerned I guess, frustrated. At least the election to designate a bargaining unit was lost, and he entertained us with a good many interesting observations about the position of a president who finds himself facing this particular problem.

It seems that if you hire the right lawyer you will find that there are 39 things that you can say, and I guess beyond that you can't say anything. But if you're interested in getting the list of 39 things, running all the way, I guess, up to saying that the proposed bargaining unit is Communistically infiltrated, you can see him after the meeting.

The unionization of hospital and health personnel is something I'm sure that all of you who have hospitals under your aegis are going to face sooner or later, and the attitudes that you may have to deal with there insofar as your people are concerned I'm sure will give you something to work away with for quite some time.

One suggestion was made that there is an article in the latest issue of **Liberal Education** by Dexter Handley of Scranton that a number of us made note of, indicating a kind of counterpoise or counter strategy insofar as collective bargaining is concerned. I am not as much excited about this perhaps as I ought to be. I'm excited about it, yes, personally, but I accept certain things as facts of life,

and I think that collective bargaining is a fact of life in our day in higher education, and we ought to be about facing that fact and not trying to dismiss it too lightly.

We never did get around, Tom, to the third item that you suggested at the beginning of our meeting. Father Baumhart said that we ought to say a few words about the higher education bill which passed, I believe, last Friday. It reminds me a little bit of the story that was told about the funeral of a distinguished man in a mountain community in Tennessee. As you know, the custom in that country is for the neighbors to gather and after the minister has said what he has to say, usually at some length, the people present, the neighbors and friends, also get an opportunity to speak a few words about the departed. And so the story is told that one of these funerals went on and on for quite some hours and finally the minister asked if there was anybody that had anything more to say about their departed brother, whereupon one man rose in the back of the room and said if everybody had finished speaking he'd like to say a few words about the sales tax, and maybe at this point perhaps Father Baumhart would like to say something about the higher education bill.

President Spiro: Thank you, and now for our third and concluding report, following which we will use the remaining time for open discussion of the entire gathering, I would like to call on President Raymond Roesch of the University of Dayton to make a report or to call on his reporter for that report.

President Raymond A. Roesch: The Good Lord smiled on me a few weeks ago when I was at a meeting of the Ohio presidents. I ran into Al Pugsley of Youngstown, and he graciously volunteered to be our recorder for this particular meeting. He's so anxious to get up here and make this report for us. *(Laughter)*

President A. L. Pugsley: Ladies and gentelmen, that's a pretty apt description of the unanimous election of a recorder by a committee by a vote of one. I undertook this assignment with some arm twisting. I noted in the bulletin that the bulletin says in the back that the presidents are expected to take a very active part in this Association, and I concluded that this was part of the initiation. Indeed, knowing that two of us are here for the first time, it seems to be that we might just as well pass a bylaw and make this a requirement for any person coming to a meeting for the first time. Thereby you would relieve the membership as a whole, and you would have a much greater attendance. *(Laughter)*

Anyway, our good chairman presented to the group of fifteen some twelve different points which he suggested might be of interest for discussion. And I would like to read those twelve to you because it seems to me they are somewhat significant in terms of the few that were chosen. He suggested: are you building dormitories; secondly, development in black studies; third, police programs; fourth, urban studies; five, campus security; six, the university as a patron of the arts; seven, housing codes; eight, pro sports affect upon college athletics; nine, credit cards and their use; ten, relations with the press; eleven, unionization of faculties; and twelfth, how are we meeting the financial crisis or financial crunch?

Now among these the first one was seized upon eagerly by the group, and I'll bet you can guess what it is. It was interesting to me that the bulletins of the previous two years had a focus, as I read the discussions, upon developments in black studies, attempts at curricular development in urban studies, and matters that in this group, at least in our particular section, we paid absolutely no attention to. Now either those problems are solved, and have been solved by this group, or they are no longer important, or there are other things that transcend them, and I think the latter is what is true.

The first one that we addressed ourselves to was unionization of faculties. We also went from that into how are we meeting the financial crisis, and we talked somewhat about dormitories, campus security and police programs.

The discussion on unionization seemed to me to direct itself more to the operational impact of unionization and concerns in operational matters than it did the philosophical approach towards these matters. There was very little discussion about the relative professionalism or lack of professionalism in the union movement and its impact upon the actual operation or the philosophy of how a faculty member can also be a union member and achieve the professional role that historically he has set up for himself. We got into then some of the discussions of the summer AAUP journal, the stance of AAUP, and the various relationships and differences between what we could regard as the AFT or the NEA, whatever it might be, and the direct unionization.

Among the institutions present, the question was asked, "how many are being unionized or are about to be, or considered, or have been?" And one institution reported that it had unionization of the faculty this particular year. Some of the others thought that

there was active movement on their campuses along these lines, and a few others expressed concern and interest in the problem but did not have presented or did not have the problem in an acute stage yet. The interest in unionization of faculties appeared to be reported as coming primarily from the new untenured faculty who with the job crunch and the job shortages that are existing in higher education now are interested specifically in holding jobs contrasting with the comment that was made that every institution in order to achieve an adequate maturity must have not a faculty of complete stability but input from some new blood with some new ideas as it goes along. This, in terms of the financial and the general condition of the country now, is difficult to achieve with or without unionization when you are letting people go rather than bringing people in, at least in part.

There were two very different opinions expressed on one matter. The unionization seems to set the faculty as a block rather than as individuals. (This was a matter of considerable concern.) And yet, one person thought that the unionization would not be interested in anything but job rights, payments, and salary levels. The other thought that if a union wasn't interested in other prerogatives, such as tenure, fringe benefits, and bringing new people in — oftentimes at the expense of persons already there — that it wouldn't be a union, because they could name no union in the country that wasn't interested in a broader base than simply the salary relationship. The fact of the matter was, it seemed to me, that the example of this was that an institution was reported in its first contract as having a very deep interest — the union — in whether a faculty member should be a trustee, and that issue was dropped only after the lawyers said that you couldn't sit on both sides of the table, as being a recipient or as being a part of management. Yet management in higher education, it has seemed to all of us, is a shared responsibility traditionally of faculties and administration, and this is part of the crunch.

Some say if unionization comes, get as many in the same bargaining agency as possible in order to avoid the whipsaw effect of competing agencies seeking the same thing or competing groups. One man said, and I am protecting the innocent by not referring to the individuals by name who made these comments — you can blame me for all misrepresentations and they have a chance to defend themselves later, I'll try to give you this as best I could understand it — but one man said, "If I were a faculty member I would say 'look, I'm only interested in the improvement of wages, not in a change in our part of management' ". But we pretty well

concluded that it would not be quite that simple, and that unions would direct their attention to the problems of management also.

It was asserted at one point that we had overlooked in the discussion the fact that in the unionization of faculties a third party is involved — not the administration of the trustees or the governments of the university versus the faculty, but that many of the decisions will be made by persons who may or may not be totally familiar with problems of the university, in other words the lawyers. The adversary conflict between those representing the legal profession within what can or cannot be done in establishing the contracts is often overlooked and sometimes it appears, unfortunately, that their lack of familiarty with how institutions are run makes us pay a pretty heavy price.

What has been the effect of the contracts on tenure? Won't the unions take over tenure? These were questions asked. Tenure plus the reduction in forces now required will, some say, drive us into unionization. So, the concluding comment on that was perhaps there were more steady state institutions than we had realized when we began talking about some of the individual institutional problems.

The number of national and regional conferences on unionization shows the degree of interest and the degree of concern that higher education has, and naturally enough out of this talk concerning unionization and the problems it brought we turned then to problems of accountability.

What is expected of a faculty member? How is it measured? And from that we went into some means by which we meet the financial crunch in terms of what is an appropriate student load, how is it measured, how does the administration make decisions or the faculty make decisions, and several plans were offered, one from one institution was reported to work quite well in setting up a fifteen hours of course work per quarter or per semester, and then attributing to the actual teaching nine, allowing then one-fifth of the total load to be for committee service and institutional service and public service and one-fifth to scholarship and three-fifths to teaching, which then gave a nine hour teaching load. Some of us thought that that might be an over-simplicity approach because it failed to recognize all kinds of things that are so very apparent to the administrator and a faculty member ranging all the way from sizes of classes, levels of work, differences between laboratory and recitation work, and so on, and that any formula has to be administered with a great deal of maturity and discretion.

Turning to the faculty evaluation then, some institutions are relying upon a preliminary or an early settlement of what the faculty member feels that he should be evaluated on and let him make the choices in this matter. Another institution rendered the idea that if they could apply a student credit hour base of 300 student credit hours per full-time faculty member, and the faculty member in effect would meet 100 students, they could achieve a $22,500 average annual salary. Well, all of these things are simply indications that there may be some ways in which institutions can pay better salaries if they can also raise and gain responsibility in terms of a better production.

Now, talking about production to faculty members is like talking about something they don't want to hear about. But when you get to unionization the basic problem, the basic concerns of unionization have always been production. And we were undetermined as to how you manage to get and retain professional approaches to these problems as opposed to the piecemeal approach of the union, because the union exists for one reason only historically, and that is to gain a better position for a relatively small group at the expense of society as a whole.

Small size classes . . . We went then into chairmen of departments and their responsibilities. The rotation of chairmen was discussed, their responsibilities, how they are chosen, and so on. We came out with very little new in terms of the kinds of discussions that usually take place with respect to chairmen.

From that point on then we took maybe a reactionary kind of concern, because we started talking about health, and in talking about health we wondered whether there were in the health training or the health educational institutions the medical schools, and so on, the basic health sciences and the relationship that they bore in universities to medical schools or medical training units. One institution reported great progress in the cooperation, but most seemed to indicate that it was not the geographical proximity of the medical school or medical organization to the university proper that was the stumbling block, that it was a deeper built-in block that had to do with whose responsibility is it to do what.

We got then to dormitories. I thought that it was of particular interest, and I think that you will too, that showering by girls in men's dormitories was a problem at one institution; it was suggested that perhaps this wasn't as bad as it might seem because viewing some of the students *any* bathing is an improvement. *(Laughter)*

We got to taxes, we got to security, and about the principal thing, other than the cooperative effects with graduate students who are put into securtiy forces in some schools, was the astonishment of one member of the group when he found that most of the institutions represented in talking about security had security forces which were armed on the campus. This seemed to me to be a good place to quit. I thank you very much, and hope I haven't been too far off.

President Spiro: Thank you for those comments. I think all of us have noted, especially those of us who are inclined to historical studies, as I am, that in American higher educational history there has been and continues to be a good deal of fadism. Different decades through the nineteenth and now the twentieth centuries have had their peculiar problems. There is a good deal of fadism in dealing with problems and issues, and on the other hand there are the realities with which we are faced. I remember several years ago saying that I simply was not going to another meeting where the theme was student unrest. That was not a fad, that was a reality of the moment. I notice that today, as far as I can recall, there has been not one word said about that problem which a year, two, three, four or five years ago was paramount in our thinking. We have heard most at this meeting, and I believe at the other meetings we attend throughout the country, about finances, and budgets. A second major topic is that of collective bargaining, labor relations on campus. A third relates to the peculiar urban problems, which really bring us together in this organization. There has also been some discussion of planning, admissions, cooperative endeavor between state related institutions and private institutions. Federal legislation is of concern to us. I believe the bill that was passed last week which embodies the largest sum ever appropriated at the federal level for education. Dormitory and campus living, the matter of security, these and other matters have appeared frequently in these three group sessions and their reports, in our programming for this entire meeting, and in our table conversation. Am I correct in asserting that possibly today the matter of finance for American higher education is a major consideration? I think that's certainly the case.

We are here particularly because of our concern with urban problems, and I would remind this audience that more than half of the American colleges and universities, not in enrollment but in the numbers of separate institutions, are rural in a sense. They are in either small towns or villages or out in the country. More than half of our colleges and universities enroll less than 1,000 students — I believe that is a correct figure — yet the vast majority of Ameri-

can young people are attending the larger institutions, say from 5,000 on up.

I'd like to open the floor now. We have about twenty minutes I believe, Mr. Chairman. Take over if I am incorrect in that assessment. I would like to invite questions from the floor or comments or responses, with the only requirement that you approach the microphone and give your name and then introduce your comment or your question or both. I would suggest that we keep comments to a brief moment so that as many people as possible will have an opportunity to make a comment or pose a question. The floor is now open. Yes, sir.

President Rodes: Dusty Rodes from General Motors Institute in Flint, Michigan . . . One of the subjects that we did not get into during our session this morning, because it didn't seem appropriate to the discussion at that time, is something that is going to take place in Michigan on January 1st and I suspect either has already or will take place in other states as well: namely, having young people at age of eighteen receive all the rights and responsibilities of full citizenship, not only the right to vote, but presumably the right to drink, the right to sign contracts, and so forth, and, particularly with the second of these, the policy regarding the use of alcoholic beverages on campus. We are currently going through the throes of trying to decide what our policy should be in both the residence halls and in campus buildings. I for one would appreciate some comments from any members of this group regarding either their experience or their plans with regard to this particular potential problem.

President Spiro: Thank you sir. A very timely subject. Who would like to respond with a comment or a relation of his experience? How many campuses, by the way — would you raise your hand — how many campuses have some restriction on the use of alcohol regardless of age? Looks like it's near unanimous. Someone had a comment over here on my left.

President Gregory B. Wolfe: I'm Gregory Wolfe of Portland State University. We are now confronted, as I guess we all are, with students interested not only in the vote but in the use of alcohol, and just a word of comfort to you . . . We've been trying, in fact we weren't trying, the students have tried to get us to recognize two things. One is that they really don't want alcohol on the campus in our state university system any more than I think some of the rest of us do for some obvious reasons, but they are interested in having adjacent to the university a student-run tavern which will

help provide the beer and the wine and perhaps also some income from which scholarship funds can be built. It's just an idea. I was very intrigued with it when it was brought to me last week, so we're going to try and see if we can't capitalize with a student-initiated compromise between bringing it into the food service and having it available nearby.

President Rodes: In that case you would not permit it at all on campus, even in private student rooms?

President Wolfe: We don't have that problem. We don't have any dormitory. But we do have a student-run system, I described in our group this morning, where liquor is in the building but it's subject to student control and supervision. And we've had no problems.

President Spiro: How many have no restrictions? Three. I believe all fifty states have some restrictions. A number of states have a law that prohibits the sale of alcoholic beverages within so many feet of a college or any sort of school or church, and this might be relevant to some of you in that respect.

President Wolfe: What about the possession in a private room in the residence hall? We've been told that after January 1st legally we will not be able to go into a student's room and discipline him in some way for the possession of a can of beer or whatever it might be. How do you handle that? Do you still say that we will not permti alcoholic beverages in the residence halls, and are you able to make that stick?

President Spiro: Aren't we in that position with regard to firearms, for example? They may be legal, and yet most of us, if not all of us, have restrictions on the possession of firearms in the rooms or on the campus. We take the posture that reasonable rules and regulations, even those that do not pertain to city, state or federal laws, are reasonable. It's an old-fashioned posture, but one that we maintain. Tom, I believe you have a comment.

Chancellor Van Arsdale: Van Arsdale of Bradley . . . Since Dusty was my predecessor at Bradley, perhaps I ought to tell you that he was bothered by a tavern throughout his term of office — a very nasty place — and he solved it by attending this meeting, and while attending this meeting he had the dean of students burn it down. **(Laughter)** It's true.

President Spiro: There **was** a tavern in the town.

Chancellor Van Arsdale: However, it seems to me that the state law still governs. And in our particular state, sale or consumption under 21 is not permitted. We do now have beer or wine or liquor in the dormitory rooms under strict supervision in that if any student is found parceling it out to those less than 21, he will be immediately expelled from the university. So far it seems to work. We haven't had any problem, and I don't like to contemplate burning down the dormitory. *(Laughter)*

President Spiro: Yes.

President Roesch: Ray Roesch from Dayton . . . We tried the idea this year of turning what we call our little cafeteria, that wasn't making any money, into a student bar, allowing the students to run it, and they're able to sell beer in it. They run it themselves. The effect has been that most of the bars outside the university have lost an awful lot of business. We have a lot of business on campus, but the general effect is that there is a lot less drinking than there had been previously. And the reason was because they used to go off campus and get tanked up and practically carried back on campus in a terrible state, but now that it's available to them under their own auspices they drink a lot less. The first weekend was horrible. I don't think we had enough beer trucks in Dayton . . . **(Laughter)** But since then it's been not so great at all, and so I think the idea that it's now permitted has taken a lot of the glamour out of it.

Unidentified Delegate: Is that 3.2 beer?

President Roesch: Yes. We follow the state law.

President Spiro: Our chairman is president of an institution in a large city called Washington where the consumption per capita, I believe, is the heaviest in the nation.

President Elliott: Well, we've been through these aches and pains as you have. We have a faculty-alumni club on campus, which is on the third floor of a six-story building, and the rest of the building is almost one-hundred percent student activities. This club has a bar, cocktail lounge, where all mixed drinks are sold. We give parents with guest privileges — we give parents guest privileges to this club — and they come for a weekend and have dinner on Saturday evening or Sunday with their sons or daughters, and this club probably has a thousand patrons a day. Then on the fifth floor of this same building there is a Rathskeller. (That's the wrong place to put a Rathskeller, but the architect got kind of

mixed up when he designed it). This seats 150, and another 150 can stand around the bar, but this is beer and pretzels and pizzas, and so forth. We have no regulations whatsoever on alcoholic beverages on our campus; we say simply that the student citizen has to meet the statutes of the District, which is eighteen. Most seventeen-year-olds by the time they register in September we find have already passed the eighteenth borderline, at least in the eyes of themselves and their fellow students. But the important conclusion I would make is that there is far less drinking on our campus now than there was when dormitories were regulated, etc. And we find exactly what you have found at Dayton, that now that it is available, it's accessible to one and all, it reverts in general to the habits which the students have brought to the campus from home, and that is that if they have had a beer or two on Saturday night they do now. They don't feel compelled, however, to go off campus to the local pubs, really get soused and have to be carried back home that night. Our problems, and we have plenty of them, are not in alcohol. It might be better if we had some more of them there.

President Spiro: One other comment about this subject before we turn to another?

Dr. Bell: Bob Bell from Long Island University . . . We have three campuses. One is distinctly urban, in the midst of Brooklyn, but the other two are farther out on Long Island. One interesting note is that when we removed the restrictions on beer and liquor, we actually saved lives; and this is measurable. When the students were forced to go off campus they drove in cars, because there is no public transportation. They got drunk, and they headed back for the dormitory and they crashed their cars, and they killed each other, and they maimed each other, and the simple fact is that we have saved lives and saved crippling injuries for a good number of students, and this is very properly measurable over the last three years.

President Spiro: Thank you. May I take the prerogative of the chair, since time is limited, and ask that we turn our attention to the subject of collective bargaining for a few moments. May I ask how many institutions represented here already have some form for faculty collective bargaining? Would you raise your hand if you have? I see three hands. I presume that the other forty or fifty of us do not. On how many campuses is this an active issue at present? One, two, three, four, six, eight, twelve. I then presume that on most campuses as of this moment that this is not an active

issue. Would anyone care to comment about the issue or offer some constructive suggestion for the body. Yes, sir.

Mr. James Clark: Bob, I'd like to ask a question, about the organizing efforts, and so forth. Perhaps some of you have had experience. We are getting the types of questions now that relate to the use of university facilities for organizing efforts — use of classrooms, auditorium — and how you respond to that? . . . Use of addressograph equipment, your campus mailing system for union activities. I'd like to have some comments from some who perhaps might have had more experience than we have.
President Spiro: That's a very perceptive set of questions. Would some one care to comment?

President Henry Saltzman: Dr. Henry Saltzman, Pratt Institute . . . I'm in the process and have been since last spring. I'd say the best thing to do at that point is make sure you have the best labor lawyer that you can possibly lay your hands on. And the question is whether, I think, and the way we approached it, is whether you felt that you had more equity to be gained by trying to take a legalistic approach to the use of your facilities, which will probably be used one way or another whether you like it or not, or whether you thought you had more equity to be gained with your faculty by trying to approach it in a rather generous and statesmanship fashion, that this was another group to be allowed expression of its interest just as many others.

We took a rather relaxed view of this. I don't think that's why we got a union. I don't think it would have a difference one way or another. I think there were more basic factors at work.

I would say this, we think that one of the important elements has been the question of how to approach, on our side, the development of our proposal — counter-proposal — to the union. We have taken the position that we constructed our proposal first and foremost on the basis of what we thought was good academic policy without the economics in the package — that is, we went through all the many, many features and aspects of the union's offer and took them one at a time and decided what we thought was in the best interest of the academic program and constructed a counter-proposal on that basis. We introduced our counter-proposal by saying that this is not an economic package, this is what we regard as an academic package. We are not sure we can even live with everything in this package, but we are presenting to you what we think makes sense from an academic standpoint from the administration's side.

We got into a very healthy, not always tranquil by any means, but what has been a very healthy dialogue, which has been an effort to try to establish an understanding and agreement about what was or was not in the interest of the academic program. We are now at the stage where we have almost completed all of our work load discussions, which has been the most crucial part of this, and we are about to price out the effects of our previous understanding.

I don't know how L.I.U. is, I think Pratt is the furtherest into this process of almost any private institution in the country. There are others around, of course.

I would say that up to this point we have found the United Federation of College Teachers a highly responsible group to deal with, particularly the national representatives, our local faculty in the collective bargaining unit less so, since they are amateurs. And what I found as president, why I welcomed it in a way — not publicly but privately — was that I finally had a professional negotiator to deal with after a year and a half of having one fellow stand up and tell me what "the faculty" wants and two days later another fellow stand up and tell me what "the faculty" wants, and then somebody else tell me.

We finally have arrived at the point where we deal with professional negotiators, and let me tell you it really is a pleasure in certain aspects. It's tough, but we have started with academic issues first, and agreement to look at the economics later if and when we ever come to agreement about what makes sense about the quality of the academic program that we would like to see in the future at Pratt. Maybe you'd like to talk about L.I.U. a little bit.

Dr. Bell: It's interesting that we approached the problem pretty much the same way that Pratt did. In the first place, the question about use of facilities, we took a very liberal attitude toward it and didn't try to control it at all. It was not particularly abused, and when the elections were finally held . . . Let me give you some history: the National Labor Relations Board ruled that our three separate campuses were three separate bargaining units. The electoins were held and the USCT won the election overwhelmingly at our Brooklyn Center. The election at our C. W. Post Center is still in doubt; there were a number of challenged votes, and these votes are now being adjudicated at the national level of the National Labor Relations Board — national level rather than at the regional level in Brooklyn. We are dealing very directly now with

the negotiating team at our Brooklyn Center, and our response was very much as Mr. Saltzman has said.

We received the union's package of demands and they were, in our terms, rather outrageous, poorly written, poorly composed, irresponsible in terms of the total effect on the institution if all the demands were met. I presume that this is the way that labor negotiations start, and you are told that the union doesn't expect to get everything that they initially ask for. Our response was not to respond directly to the package of demands but to try to change the nature of the union-management interaction; that is try to change it from what has been what we call the industrial model and take the opportunity, since we were one of the first private institutions in the country to be involved in this, to take the opportunity to try to change from negotiating on an industrial model to negotiating in some kind of new model, an academic model, if you will.

The biggest problem in this is, of course, the National Labor Relations Board, and I might use this platform to make an appeal. There is a serious problem, and you'll all have to face this at some point. The National Labor Relations Board simply doesn't yet know what it is doing, and it's making decisions on the basis of inadequate information. Witness the fact that at Long Island University they ruled that department chairmen were management and therefore ineligible to vote. At Fordham University they ruled that faculty chairmen were faculty, or department chairmen were faculty, therefore they were eligible to vote. I think there's been another decision now somewhere else — I forget where it was — again reaffirming that chairmen of departments were faculty members and could vote. So there are these inconsistencies.

We have appealed to the American Council on Education. We have gone to people at the Association of American Colleges. We have asked the Association of American Universities, the Association of State Universities to be concerned about this, hoping that we could have the educational community focusing on this problem as a group that was more able to reach the National Labor Relations Board than one individual institution could do, or even a couple of institutions in concert.

We had contemplated at one time joining the suit that Fordham University initiated to have the National Labor Relations Board ruled ineligible, but we didn't, and then they were subsequently overruled and their decision stood — the National Labor Relations Board decision stood.

On the matter of bargaining, Mr. Saltzman was right. I don't think we have gotten into the actual bargaining situation as Pratt has, and this is somewhat deliberate. We have, I'd say quite honestly in effect, dragged our feet, hoping that we could repersuade some of the faculty that perhaps their concerns were more for matters of insecurity, not necessarily related to the job but maybe related to management, related to the situation in the nation in general, problems other than just simply the need to be represented by a union. And to some extent I think perhaps we are succeeding in that.

The other thing we felt we needed to do was to gain some time, just to allow this thing to be put into perspective, and this also has succeeded to some extent. We see now that the union movement, the hard core union people, are really a very, very small part of our total faculty, and when this decision was made back in last spring and the elections were held, in effect we had to go to bargaining in June, and it was the end of the academic year and the faculty was disbursed. We realized that we really didn't have a very good reading on what the faculty actually felt, and we quite consciously dragged our feet until after the new academic year got started, with the thought that if the faculty were there, and if we had a chance to talk to them, and if we were in meetings together that we would learn more and that, as I say, this perspective would come. And I think that this really is happening. I think that the union now is also recognizing that they are a very small part of the total faculty, even though they won an election and we are under the compulsion of the law to negotiate with them, the fact that they also now recognize that they are representing only a very small part of the faculty.

I think my counsel would be that when you get into this situation move slowly. We've been counseled in fifteen different directions, some people saying get in and fight them as hard as you can as quickly as you can and reach a conclusion as quickly as you can. I think that what we actually did is far better, and that is to really go as slowly as is possible — to go as slowly as you can without being charged with an unfair labor practice by the union.

It's new ground. I think that everyone will have something different to add to this. I would emphasize again this need for the educational community to perhaps stand together and try to get the National Labor Relations Board to take a better look at what higher education is. Higher education is not the steel industry.

It is not the automobile industry. And yet in effect we are being told we have to negotiate pretty much on that model, and we are trying to change it. I think we are succeeding a little bit. It's very slow and it's very difficult to assess. I would agree with Mr. Saltzman though that the representatives, the professional representatives, from the union are very good, they are not irresponsible. The irresponsibility or the impatience comes from the amateurs on the faculty. As a matter of fact this is manifested — actually it's going on right now — the union chapter is removing the person that they first selected as their chairman, the man to really represent them on the faculty. They are removing him because now they are impatient with him, and they're going to put someone else in, and the fact is that without really trying to we have almost created dissension within their own ranks. They don't really know what they want, and again I think that this is a reason for moving fairly slowly.

President Spiro: Thank you very much. Our time has expired. My concluding, half-facatious comment would be in connection with that subject that perhaps we will have to revise the time-honored and historic designation of officers of faculty and officers of administration in view of developments that seem to be taking place, especially on the urban campuses, and I suspect especially in the Northeast and in the Far West.

Mr. Chairman, before I relinquish the chair let me say to you ladies and gentlemen, my colleagues, that we will indeed be happy to have you come to our fair city for the meeting a year hence. I believe you will find excellent air service, nonstop in most cases, into Jacksonville, the largest city in Florida. We have a new consolidated government in which we consolidated the city and county government. Some of you might be interested in looking at that while you are in town, and the proximity to the river and the ocean is very sweet, and if any of you would care to do so we would be glad to help you make arrangements if you can and wish to come a day or two early.

LUNCHEON SESSION

Monday, November 8, 1971

The luncheon session of the annual meeting was held in the Hubbard Room of the Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel, Chicago, Illinois. The meeting was called to order at 12:15 p.m., Monday, November 8, 1971 by President Lloyd H. Elliott, President of the Association, presiding.

President Elliott: Continue with your coffee and dessert if you'd like. It might be in the interest of meeting schedules if we proceed, however.

Our speaker today is well known to this audience. You know him in person perhaps as well as in print. He is a Scotsman. He came to this country in 1925, and it's reassuring to find a Scotsman in Washington, although Peter does admit that every three or four years he has to be sent back to Scotland for a little retreading in order to get some of the Washington air replaced.

Peter Muirhead had a distinguished career in New York State before he came to Washington in 1958 as the director of the higher educational programs in the U.S. Office. And it speaks for him that he has survived in Washington since 1958, because many people who go there leave on much shorter notice. It is said, of course, that U.S. commissioners come and go but Peter Muirhead goes on.

To introduce Peter as an old veteran of Washington battles would be doing him a disservice because he's not that old, but to introduce him as a new expert or a young authority would be to shortchange him also, because he is one of the most knowledgeable persons in the United States on the business in which we are all engaged. So I'm going to introduce Peter Muirhead simply as a friend and associate and one of the real pros in the business. Peter, we appreciate your coming out to Chicago this morning to be with us. This audience is yours, and you and they are at each other's mercy. *(Applause)*

Mr. Peter P. Muirhead: Well, needless to say, after an introduction like that I am delighted to be here. I must remind Lloyd, however, after all those kind things he said about me, that my Scottish mother told me: she said, "Peter, watch out for perfume. It's all right to spray it, but don't swallow it."

I am delighted to be here, Lloyd, and I was quite charmed when I got here a little early and enjoyed one of your meetings and learned that among all your problems, and you have a great many of them, all of your problems, the sale of alcoholic beverages didn't

give you very much trouble. *(Laughter)* suppose as a Scot I should say it's good if you can pickle your problems in alcohol then maybe you can solve them better.

I think in this group we could quickly reach consensus that post-secondary education — I like to call it that rather than higher education — that post-secondary education has indeed endured some very uncertain times in the past few years, and that you could call a British understatement. But I think, fortunately in a way, we have been comforted in our travail by a number of studies — and I read about one coming out on the plane — studies which have illumined the problems that beset us. At least they have done that, and at best they have responded to Burns' plaintive plea:

"Oh, wad some Pow'r the giftie gie us
To see oursels as others see us!"

For example, within the past few weeks we have seen the release of two additional Carnegie Reports. The first one is entitled, "A Degree, What Else?" I read a newspaper report about that last week and it had the heading: "Study Finds That College Is Good For You." *(Laughter)* That was refreshing. It points out that among other things up to now going to college has benefited students personally and economically and that benefits have increased with each additional year on campus. Of course it is concerned primarily with the effects of a college education, and we do take some comfort in it, and it is a kind of an oasis in the desert of descent, but, as you would be quick to point out, it does not deal with the question of access to higher education nor to the casualties who have dropped out along the way.

The second of these reports that have just come out is entitled, "New Students and New Places." Of course I'm sure that all of you are familiar with it, but it seemed to me that it was quite appropriate to our discussion today, for it projects the enrollments and costs that will confront colleges and universities within the next three decades. And particularly salient to your mission, the mission of your institutions are some of the following assertions and recommendations.

One, the report says, we find a major deficit of two types of institutions — community colleges and comprehensive urban colleges, especially those with a population in the urban area over 500,000. It also says the inner cities in particular are not well served by higher education. Higher education has not adequately

reflected the urbanization of America, and you could have written that.

By 1980 the nation will need between 80 and 100 new comprehensive urban colleges, 60 to 70 of them in the larger metropolitan areas. In addition, it will also need an additional 175 to 250 two-year community colleges, most of them in the urban areas.

Now what I find particularly poignant, in view of the summation of the effects of college in the first report that I suggested to you, is the conclusion that young people who live in suburban areas are more likely to attend college than those living in urban areas. And those living in the poverty portions of our cities are especially unlikely to attend college. There's nothing original about that, but there's something awfully significant about it. In short, those who could most profit from a post-secondary education either lack access to that opportunity or for a variety of socio-economic reasons appear to be too discouraged to attempt it. This then permits me, if you will, to emphasize in a not wholly ingenious manner that one of the basic goals of the Administration is to promote the reality of equal educational opportunities.

As the President said last year in his message on higher education, no qualified student who wants to go to college should be barred by lack of money. That has long been a great American goal, continued the President, and I propose that we achieve it now. And I know that no other sector of our higher education enterprise in this country, no other sector, has a more crucial role to play than urban colleges and universities in achieving that worthy objective.

The second of the Carnegie Reports that I referred to recognizes that we can expect new patterns of enrollment for post-secondary education — more students of competent ability from the lower half of the socio-economic scale, and more students from among persons not now considered of college age. It is likely that the goals of these students will be as diverse as their backgrounds. Some will want degrees, some will want training for a short career and not leading to a degree, some will want to study while working or to interrupt their studes for work, assuming they can pick up where they left off later, and some will want to study simply for the enrichment of their lives. It would seem axiomatic then to claim that diversity of training opportunities must be the name of the game for post-secondary education in the years ahead.

There is yet another reason, among many, why I am glad that your president invited me to join you today: that is, the emphasis

that urban colleges and universities place on service to their communities. Your institutions, of course, are intimately involved with the problems of the cities and the people that live in them. And I cite as evidence of that commitment some of the exemplary projects that urban institutions have undertaken with support under Title I of the Higher Education Act — that title called Community Services and Continuing Education. Now I cite from here not so much for your information as for the information of those who are not as knowledgeable as you are but are more critical.

Let me cite Cleveland University. In Cleveland, Cleveland State University brought together representatives of all their educational institutions, community service agencies and organizations to develop an effective community extenson plan for the Cleveland metropolitan area. Activities initiated under that program included community workshops, a community and consumer education project, and a management training program for black businessmen.

In Milwaukee a consortia known as the Title I Inter-Institutional Committee, which includes representatives of the University of Wisconsin of Milwaukee, Alberta College, Concordia, Mount Berry, and Milwaukee Art Technical College, have developed a series of projects directed at alleviating inter-city racial tension. Workshops involving adult groups and a special series of television programs, have led to greater understanding among blacks and whites. It seems to me that type of thing provides insights so that various groups can deal with each other's real problems and fears.

In Washington, D. C., a consortia of six area colleges and universities are cooperatively conducting a community governance project. In this program faculty and students from various disciplines work as an inter-university team to aid the District of Columbia government in the realigning and strengthening of their municipal services, and by providing advisory and technical assistance to officials of several departments.

I cite those because somehow or other you have not been able to master the technique of telling some of the good things you do. We don't seem to be particularly adept at doing that, and consequently we are sometimes subjected to criticism by people who are not as knowledgeable as you are.

Since the community services and continuing education programs came into being, some $50 million has been allotted to thousands of projects conducted under the leadership of your institutions and many other institutions in every state. And in this regard I would

like to call attention to a provision of the legislation now before the Congress, a provision that I think may be of special interest to your Association and its member institutions. This provision would amend the Title I that I referred to by authorizing the making of special grants to institutions of higher education which are located within or adjacent to standard metropolitan areas. These grants would be available for assisting such institutions in planning and developing and carrying out comprehensive programs especially designed, if you will, to apply the resources of higher education to the problems of urban communities.

Now, having referred to the legislation before the Congress, I have the opening that I needed to talk a little bit about the current scene in Washington, to paraphrase the title of the speech which was suggested by President Elliott. As you no doubt are aware, the Senate and the House are about to move to conference as they seek to resolve some major differences of opinions regarding the future role in higher education. Now, as every political scientist on your campuses has pointed out to his classes on innumerable occasions, politics is the art of compromise. And there is no better illustration of politics being the art of compromise than the conference procedure in the Congressional mode of action.

I would like to paraphrase with you what one of our great statesmen has said about the conference procedure. Winston Churchill had this to say about it (I sanitized it a little bit), said Churchill, speaking of the conference method: "It is easier for eight or nine mature and politically-minded men and women to feel their way toward unanimity if they are not compelled to conduct their converging maneuvers under the microscopes and the telescopes of the press, but are permitted to shuffle about a little bit in their slippers." That is the conference.

Needless to say, you have the greatest interest at stake in that debate, for its resolutions will most profoundly affect our urban institutions and the students they serve. Consequently, I would like to spend a few minutes delineating some of the crucial issues before the conference, and I need not remind you that I am not an entirely detached observer.

The Administration's legislative proposal embodies four basic concepts of aid to higher education: first, equality of opportunity; second, institutional aid compatible with the national purpose; third, support for research; and fourth, encouragement of innovation and reform. Perhaps not surprisingly the House and the Senate have major disagreements over at least three of those four concepts.

In order to more fully realize the objective, the first one I mentioned, of equality of opportunity at the post-secondary level, the Administration has proposed using student aid in such a way that would guarantee that available funds would reach the neediest students first, and in sufficient amount to make it possible for them to get a college education. And it's right and proper that that should happen, for despite all of our recent progress the sad statistic still remains that a student from a family with an income of $15,000 per year is still five times more likely to attend college than a student from a family of less than $5,000. I think it also fair to point out that the Administration in making this proposal to Congress gave some indication of their sincerity, because the Administration at the same time that they submitted the authorizing language to the Congress has assured the Congress that in fiscal 1972 and fiscal 1973 budget requests there will be enough money requested to do the job.

Now, the Senate — and those of you who wish to pursue this a little farther would refer to S.659 — has largely incorporated this concept in its bill. It would insure grants to all needy students from low income families as entitlements. The House — and there the number is HR.7248 — on the other hand has rejected the targeting concept, preferring to distribute student grants over a wide range of family income and providing no assurance or guarantee to the neediest students. This then is one issue whose outcome must await the Senate-House conference. It seems to me that whether we mean to change the rhetoric of equal educational opportunity to reality would seem to hinge on that particular issue.

Beyond student aid looms the newer and perhaps more controversial question of federal institutional assistance. And here we have what I consider to be a great watershed in the development of the federal interest in higher education. The Administration has provided some support for that, and here is the line of reasoning. An expanded program of student aid — vastly expanded program of student aid — without a corresponding program of operational support for colleges would indeed create problems and probably chaos. Waves of students, many of them federally assisted, have swamped and will continue to swamp your institutions. You must find places for them in the dorm, in the lecture room, and in the lab. The disadvantaged student in particular brings with him specialized needs that your institutions find costly. Now on top of this normal financial strain, we are still living with the added burden of inflation and a cutback in research funds; therefore, the Administration has proposed to the Congress institutional aid, and that is a great watershed. This is the first time that an Administration has

proposed to the Congress institutional aid to colleges and universities. This Administration has proposed to Congress institutional aid in the form of cost-of-education allowance funds that would be tied to the institution's total federal student aid funds in recognition of the burden imposed on institutions that are educating significant numbers of disadvantaged students. And this is significant; those funds would be used in each institution according to the way in which that institution, not the federal government, deemed proper and effective.

Now the Senate bill incorporates this concept and follows the same rationale in its institutional aid provision. The House, on the other hand, has adopted a formula which would provide most institutional aid — two-thirds to be precise — on the basis of full-time enrollment. Now since many urban institutions serve such a high proportion of disadvantaged students, they would stand to gain more in federal funding support under the Administration's cost-of-education allowance provisions than under a formula that would distribute the same amount of money on an enrollment basis to all colleges and universities across the board. But even if this were not so — and in some instances it is not — the concept of initiating federal institutional aid to help fulfill a pressing national purpose — equal educational opportunity — is a worthy one.

I am pleased to be able to report that the third of the priorities that I shared with you, that of encouragement and support of basic and applied research, is not now subject to basic disagreement in Congress. It now appears likely that the current legislation will include passage of an Administration initiative and a Congressional initiative of major research significance, the establishment of a National Institute of Education. NIE is the shorthand for it, and as we hope it will emerge, it would be a new department agency concerned with how to restructure our educational system for greater effectiveness, how to increase access to education, broaden the age range of learning, increase the reality of the learning place, design learning programs for individuals, how to increase the range of resources for learning — in brief how to improve teaching and learning from pre-primary through the graduate school. NIE would, in sum, tie a vast assortment of scattered theories and experiments, hopefully, into a more coherent whole, and, I think, in the process move the art of education research to a new level of competence and respectability. And it's long overdue.

I would like to direct your attention particularly to the last of the Administration higher education priorities, the encouragement of innovation and reform. That takes its shape in the National Founda-

tion of Higher Education. This Foundation is cast in the spirit of encouraging innovation and supporting higher educational institutions to meet the additional costs of exemplary programs leading to change and innovation. As such it is, I think, a direct and highly imaginative response to a need for renewal that all of us have long recognized. I think this enterprise could go far toward helping you in your efforts to diversify post-secondary schooling and opening it up to new ideas and to new people and certainly to people who are now excluded as too old or disqualified by reason of circumstances. We believe moreover, and I'm sure that you do too, that the Foundation, under the leadership of a Board of Directors representing all facets of higher education, could do much to influence government policy and the shaping of a viable federal interest in higher education during the years ahead. And I can say this with better grace than any of you, there is need for that type of competence in Washington, there is need for the voice of higher education to be heard in Washington, and here would be an excellent place for that voice to be heard, through the Board of Directors of a proposed Foundation for Higher Education.

In summary then, the institute — the NIE — is designed to increase our understanding of the educational process, the impact of education on values and attitudes, the learning problems of college-age youth, and the institutions' need for resources and their effective allocation. The National Foundation, on the other hand, would be a place to devise ways to cope with these problems and significantly alter expectations of higher education on the part of practically everybody — parents, students, educators, the community, the government, business. They are all expecting that higher education will diversify and that it will serve in different ways in the years ahead. The foundation should be a substantial help to you in resolving your problems, whatever they may be in your institution, through the purposeful engagement of minds and wills and talents. It will be a source of money — $100 million in the first year of operation — that you could use as you saw fit to probe the potential of both your students and your institutions and develop new and hopefully imaginative answers for each. Unlike the institute, however, unlike the NIE, the foundation's future in Congress is still in doubt. While the Senate has incorporated the foundation into its bill, the House has not. Consequently the fate of this critical proposal will be determined in the upcoming Congress. I think I would join with you in earnestly hoping that the Senate's opinion will prevail on this issue.

Nineteen seventy-one then appears to be another year of decision in the evolving federal interest in higher education — an

interest, if you will, that has been taking shape as a kind of a partnership for progress and has been taking shape at an accelerated rate since the enactment of the National Defense Education Act in 1958. How successful we all are in furthering this partnership for progress, I think, will depend to a very large degree upon your commitment and your efforts to bring about a fuller understanding in our society and particularly in the Congress — to bring about a fuller understanding of how the federal government can best serve you in bringing about equal educational opportunity, improved quality, and revitalization in higher education. I come to the conclusion, based on your past achievements, that I can only be optimistic, and I think you have equal cause for optimism. Thank you. **(Applause)**

President Elliott: Thank you very much, Peter, for a most informative report and analysis of the current legislation and of the very critical issues which face higher education as a result of the legislative program in the Congress.

Peter has said he would spend a few minutes if you would wish in answering questions. I don't want to impose upon your already exhibited good nature, because I know some of you have planes to catch, but I'm going to ask a question, Peter, which I suspect — I hope — would be of interest to this entire group, and that is a very hard-nosed one. Two or three columnists in the last few days have suggested that the anti-busing rider which the House put onto this bill could result in an impasse for all of the legislation. Any last minute reading on that situation from Washington as of this Monday morning?

Mr. Muirhead: There's no doubt that the tactics that were followed in getting the passage of the Emergency School Assistance Act added on as an amendment to the higher education legislation in the House has indeed made the ultimate passage a good deal more complicated, if for no other reason than that the conference bill on the House side now consists of the legislation that I outlined to you plus the Emergency School Assistance Act amended to prevent the use of those monies to support busing. And on the Senate side, the Higher Education Act has stood separate from the Emergency School Assistance Act. So it will now be necessary for the Senate — under the procedures that Congress follows — to package a bill that is comparable to the bill that stands on the House side, and that takes time, where if this amendement had not been made to the Higher Education Bill, the procedure would have been available for the conferees to meet this morning if need be. It probably will mean now that the conference will be postponed awhile.

I sense no ulterior motive in that procedure other than the fact that it will delay the passage of the legislation, but I continue to feel that both pieces of legislation are so clearly in the public interest . . . An interesting thing, I'm sure you have observed it, is that when the tumult and the shouting dies, education legislation has tremendous bipartisan support. I call to your attention that S-659 went through the Senate without a dissenting vote. You can't do much better than that. And the vote in the House for the amended bill was overwhelmingly in favor, bipartisan. So there is a commitment in both Houses to move the legislation forward: it may just take a little longer.

President Spiro: Mr. Muirhead, may I ask this question? The **current issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education** contains a debate between John Bradamus and your office relating to the National Institute. I wonder how you would respond and rebut his idea that this would simply be another level of bureaucracy, that the money would not be well spent and could be better spent under other auspices and perhaps by other means?

Mr. Muirhead: I'll add to the commercial for the **Chronicle** too. On the back page of the **Chronicle** — the November 1 issue — there is a statement by Commissioner Marland and John Bradamus, Congressman from Indiana. Congressman Bradamus — and I bow to no one in my respect and admiration for him — has been the principal architect of the institute legislation as it has moved through the House. He has what I consider to be very legitimate intellectual problems with the foundation — and the debate is not on the institute, the debate is on the Foundation. The debate on the institute is over; that has been resolved. Congressman Bradamus feels that many of the objectives of the foundation could be accomplished under the institute. Commissioner Marland believes, and I do too of course, that the Foundation of Higher Education is not a research organization, that the institute is indeed a research organization covering the whole gamut of education, including higher education, but what is needed in higher education is the type of program that will encourage, through the project grant approach, exemplary programs not necessarily research activities that we have made innovative ideas that need to get the spur of additional support. I believe, and I think you would agree with me, that the National Institute for Education will probably put most of its emphasis on elementary-secondary education, and it probably should, because the greatest need for research in learning does lie in elementary-secondary education and probably at the early childhood education level, so that if higher education really then is going to have an opportunity to move out in new areas for the

needed innovation and change, the foundation offers this very best hope. And that's the essence of the debate that is in the **Chronicle**.

President Elliott: Father Carron.

President Carron: I was just wondering, when the legislation passes, is it likely or unlikely that it will be funded right away?

Mr. Muirhead: Again, as I tried to indicate in my remarks, the Administration has submitted what by almost any standard what can be called a very liberal program in support of education, with emphasis on serving the disadvantaged. And in so doing, they did something that was rather unique in governmental circles. They sent forward a proposal in authorizing language, as it's called in the vernacular in Washington, but at the same time they provided assurance to the Congress that there would be in the '72 budget and in the '73 budget enough money requested to carry it out. Now that, I think, is a pretty good example of putting your money where your mouth is. The short hand answer to your question is that if the legislation emerges in a reasonable facsimilie of what the Administration has proposed that it will be funded.

President Elliott: Let's have one more question, if there is one, and then we will adjourn this conference. Yes, President Fuller.

President Fuller: The Pell bill in the Senate stresses the importance of support probably where it needs to be most of all in the minority problems. On the other hand, the House bill spreads it over everyone in a much more even way and therefore probably wins more votes. Does that give us an indication of where the wind is blowing?

Mr. Muirhead: I don't know. But if what you say is true, I'm trying to change the direction of that wind a little, because I think the concept that is in the Pell bill is so clearly in harmony with the mission of higher education that during a period when federal resources are limited, and there is no indication that that period is going to change very much in the years ahead — the resources are limited, there are competing priorities for federal resources — that when those resources are made available they should continue to pursue the goal of equal educational opportunity, and that's what the Pell bill, both in its student aid provision and its institutional aid provision would support. There is, of course, the siren call of taking whatever resources you have and spreading them over a much wider target so that everybody gets less but everybody gets something. But it seems to me that we ought to be vigorous enough

in our commitment to that mission that has so long characterized American higher education that we would say in effect "the job is not done yet. We need to provide equal educational opportunity in this country, and let's give that a priority." Hopefully the time will come when we can broaden it, but in the meantime let's target it where it belongs.

President Elliott: We thank you, Commissioner Muirhead, for being with us today. **(Applause)** And needless to say we shall be watching the action and the inaction on Capitol Hill with great interest.

Ladies and gentlemen, this concludes our annual meeting. Thanks to Bob Spiro, we shall see you in Jacksonville, Florida, on one of those beautiful balmy November days of 1972. We are adjourned.

APPENDIX A

Constitution of the Association of Urban Universities
(Adopted November 16, 1915)

ARTICLE I — Name

The name of this Association shall be the Association of Urban Universities.

ARTICLE II — Objects

The objects of the Association are: To study the special problems and the special opportunities for service of universities and colleges located in cities and to bring about more effective cooperation between such institutions and the cities in the methods for training for municipal, state, and national service.

ARTICLE III — Dues and Membership

Membership shall be institutional.[1]

Colleges and universities of degree-giving rank[2] may become members upon election by the Association or by the Executive Committee and upon payment of dues.

Each institution shall be entitled to one vote at meetings of the Association.

Membership dues shall be fixed by the Association at the annual meeting.[3] Failure to pay membership dues for two successive years shall result in forfeiture of membership.

ARTICLE IV — Officers

The officers of the Association shall be a president, a vice-president, and a secretary-treasurer, who shall perform the duties usually pertaining to their respective offices. The president and vice-

---

[1]The following institutions are listed as charter members in the minutes of the first meeting: University of Akron, Boston University, University of Buffalo, University of Cincinnati, Hunter College, Johns Hopkins University, University of Louisville, College of the City of New York, New York University, Northwestern University, University of Pennsylvania, University of Pittsburgh, Reed College, Temple University, University of Toledo, Washington University.

[2]The words "of degree-giving rank" did not appear in the original draft of the constitution but were added by action of the Association in November, 1929, at the annual meeting in Cincinnati.

[3]The annual dues were ten dollars from 1915 to 1928, incl.; fifteen dollars from 1929 to 1946, incl.; thirty dollars from 1947 to 1954; forty dollars from 1954 to 1958; fifty dollars since 1958; increased to seventy-five dollars in 1966.

president shall be elected annually for a term of one year,[4] and the secretary-treasurer for three years. All officers shall serve until their successors shall be duly chosen.

Nominations for officers shall be made by a nominating committee of three to be appointed at each annual meeting by the president, and opportunity shall be given for other nominations to be made from the floor.

ARTICLE V — Executive Committee

The three officers above named shall constitute the Executive Committee, which shall prepare the programs for all meetings and in the interims between meetings shall act for the Association in every way not contrary to the letter or spirit of this constitution.

ARTICLE VI — Meetings and Quorum

At meetings of the Association, each member institution may be represented by one representative, who shall be entitled to vote, and by any number of delegates, who may participate in discussion but shall not be entitled to vote.

The annual meeting of the Association shall be held at such time and place as the Association or the Executive Committee shall determine, provided that each member institution shall be advised of the time and place by mail at least thirty days prior to the meeting.

Twenty-five members duly represented shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of any business.[1]

ARTICLE VII — Amendments

The constitution may be amended by unanimous vote at any annual meeting, or, if notice of the proposed change has been given at a previous meeting or published in the official notice of the meeting, it may be amended by a two-thirds vote at any annual meeting.

The Association voted at the 1936 meeting to adopt the following amendment to the Constitution:

No resolutions or motions bearing on educational or administrative policy, or general resolutions dealing with controversial issues shall be considered except in executive sessions of the Association.

[1]Prior to unanimous agreement in 1961 to amend this section, the vice president was elected every other year for a two-year term.

[1]By action of the membership at the 1954 annual meeting, the quorum was increased from five to twenty-five.

APPENDIX B

Chronological List of Officers of the Association

Presidents

Charles W. Dabney, President, University of Cincinnati, 1914-1915.
Sidney Edward Mezes, President, College of the City of New York, 1915-1916.
Samuel Black McCormick, Chancellor, University of Pittsburgh, 1916-1917.
Lemuel A. Murlin, President, Boston University, 1917-1919.
Frederic A. Hall, Chancellor, Washington University, St. Louis, 1920-1921.
Lotus D. Coffman, President, University of Minnesota, 1921-1922.
Samuel P. Capen, Chancellor, University of Buffalo, 1922-1923.
Parke R. Kolbe, President, University of Akron, 1923-1924.
William Mather Lewis, President, George Washington University, 1924-1925.
William H. P. Faunce, President, Brown University, 1925-1926.
Thomas S. Baker, President, Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1926-1927.
Frederick B. Robinson, President, College of the City of New York, 1927-1928.
Frederick C. Hicks, President, University of Cincinnati, 1928-1929.
Josiah H. Penniman, Provost, University of Pennsylvania, 1929-1930.
Henry J. Doermann, President, University of the City of Toledo, 1930-1931.
Frederick W. Shipley, Dean, Washington University, St. Louis, 1931-1932.
Paul H. Linehan, Director, College of the City of New York, 1932-1933.
Raymond A. Kent, President, University of Louisville, 1933-1934.
Everett W. Lord, Dean, Boston University, 1934-1935.
Charles L. Spain, Executive Vice-President, Wayne University, 1935-1936.
Guy E. Snavely, President, Birmingham-Southern College; Executive Secretary, Association of American Colleges, 1936-1937.
Raymond Walters, President, University of Cincinnati, 1937- 1938.
Eugene A. Colligan, President, Hunter College, 1938-1939.
Rowland Haynes, President, University of Omaha, 1939-1940.
Winfred G. Leutner, President, Western Reserve University, 1940-1941.
H. E. Simmons, President, University of Akron, 1941-1943.[1]

---

[1]Elected for the year 1941-1942; consented to serve until 1942-1943 after the 1942 meeting was cancelled.

Henry T. Heald, President, Illinois Institute of Technology, 1943-1944.
Philip C. Nash, President, University of Toledo, 1944-1945.
David D. Henry, President, Wayne University, 1945-1946.
R. H. Fitzgerald, Chancellor, University of Pittsburgh, 1946-1947.
M. O. Ross, President, Butler University, 1947-1948.
Paul F. Douglass, President, The American University, 1948-1949.
James Creese, President, Drexel Institute of Technology, 1949-1950.
Paul C. Reinert, S.J., President, Saint Louis University, 1950-1951.
David A. Lockmiller, President, University of Chattanooga, 1951-1952.
T. R. McConnell, Chancellor, University of Buffalo, 1952-1953.
Robert W. Van Houten, President, Newark College of Engineering, 1953-1954.
Edward J. O'Donnell, S.J., President, Marquette University, 1954-1955.
Norman P. Auburn, President, University of Akron, 1955-1956.
John S. Millis, President, Western Reserve University, 1956-1957. 1961.
Philip Davidson, President, University of Louisville, 1957-1958.
Chester M. Alter, Chancellor, University of Denver, 1958-1959.
Jay F. W. Pearson, President, University of Miami, 1959-1960.
Laurence J. McGinley, S.J., President, Fordham University, 1960-1961.
Clarence B. Hilberry, President, Wayne State University, 1961-1962.
Carter Davidson, President, Union College, 1962-1963.
Milo Bail, President, University of Omaha, 1963-1964.
T. W. Van Arsdale, Jr., President, Bradley University, 1964-1965.
Philip G. Hoffman, President, University of Houston, 1965-1966.
Richard F. Humphreys, President, The Cooper Union, 1966-1967.
J. Martin Klotsche, Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 1967-1968.
Leo McLaughlin, S.J., President, Fordham University, 1968-1969.
Norman A. Parker, Chancellor, Chicago Circle Campus, University of Illinois, 1969-1970.
Lloyd H. Elliott, President, The George Washington University, 1970-1971.
Harold L. Enarson, President, Cleveland State University, 1971-1972.

Vice-Presidents

Everett W. Lord, Dean, Boston University, 1914-1915.
Augustus R. Hatton, Professor of Political Science, Western Reserve University, 1915-1917.
Parke R. Kolbe, President, University of Akron, 1917-1919.

Frank P. Graves, President, University of the State of New York and Commissioner of Education, State of New York, 1919-1921.
Winfred G. Leutner, Dean, Western Reserve University, 1921-1923.
Frederick W. Shipley, Director, Division of University Extension, Washington University, 1923-1925.
Richard R. Price, Director of University Extension Service, University of Minnesota, 1925-1927.
Theodore J. Grayson, Director, Evening School of Accounts and Finance, University of Pennsylvania, 1927-1929.
Vincent W. Lanfear, Director, Downtown Division, University of Pittsburgh, 1929-1931.
Rufus D. Smith, Director, University Extension Division, New York University, 1931-1933.
Raymond Walters, President, University of Cincinnati, 1933-1935.
Charles J. Deane, Vice-President and Dean, Fordham University, 1935-1937.
Parke R. Kolbe, President, Drexel Institute of Technology, 1937-1939.
H. E. Simmons, President, University of Akron, 1939-1941.
Henry T. Heald, President, Illinois Institute of Technology, 1941-1943.
David D. Henry, Executive Vice-President, Wayne University, 1943-1945.
Ben Cherrington, Chancellor, University of Denver, 1945-1947.
M. O. Ross, President, Butler University, 1946-1947.
James Creese, President, Drexel Institute of Technology, 1947-1949.
David A. Lockmiller, President, University of Chattanooga, 1949-1951.
Robert W. Van Houten, President, Newark College of Engineering, 1951-1953.
Norman P. Auburn, President, University of Akron, 1953-1955.
Philip Davidson, President, University of Louisville, 1955-1957.
Jay F. W. Pearson, President, University of Miami, 1957-1959.
Clarence B. Hilberry, President, Wayne State University, 1959-1961.
Carter Davidson, President, Union College, 1961-1962.
Milo Bail, President, University of Omaha, 1962-1963.
Thomas H. Carroll, President, George Washington University, 1963-1964.
William F. Kelley, S.J., President, Marquette University, 1964-October 1965.

---

[1]Resigned, 1946.

[2]Elected to complete Dr. Cherrington's term which would have ended at the close of the 1947 meeting.

Philip G. Hoffman, President, University of Houston, October-November, 1965.

Richard F. Humphreys, President, The Cooper Union, 1965-1966.

J. Martin Klotsche, Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 1966-1967.

Leo McLaughlin, S.J., President, Fordham University, 1967-1968.

Norman A. Parker, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle Campus, 1968-1969.

Lloyd H. Elliott, President, George Washington University, 1969-1970.

Kirk E. Naylor, President, University of Nebraska at Omaha, 1970-1971.

John P. Raynor, S.J., President, Marquette University, 1971-1972.

Secretary-Treasurers

Walter E. Clark, Professor of Political Science, College of the City of New York, 1914-1915.

Frederick B. Robinson, Director, Evening Session, College of the City of New York and Dean, School of Business and Civic Administration, 1915-1926.

C. S. Marsh, Dean, Evening Session of the School of Business Administration, University of Buffalo, 1926-1935.

Roscoe M. Ihrig, Director, Division of General Studies, Director of Evening Courses, Dean of Freshmen in Engineering, Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1935-1940.

F. W. Schockley, Director, University Extension, Summer Sessions and Late Afternoon, Evening, and Saturday Classes, University of Pittsburgh, 1940-1947.[1]

David D. Henry, Executive Vice Chancellor, New York University, 1947-1956.[2]

Robert W. Van Houten, President, Newark College of Engineering, 1954-1956.[3]

Norman P. Auburn, President, University of Akron, 1956-1965.

T. W. Van Arsdale, President, Bradley University, 1965-1968.

Robert Harry Spiro, President, Jacksonville University, 1968-

---

[1]Completed Dr. Roscoe M. Ihrig's term which ended in October, 1941 and was elected for a three-year term, 1941-1944, and for a second three-year term, 1944-1947.

---

[1]Completed Dr. Roscoe M. Ihrig's term which ended in October,

---

[2]Resigned, 1954.

[3]Appointed to fill Dr. David D. Henry's unexpired term.

APPENDIX C

Registered Attendance, Association of Urban Universities, 56th Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida, November 1-2, 1970 (as of October 29, 1970)

AKRON, UNIVERSITY OF
President Norman P. Auburn
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
Dr. and Mrs. Martin D. Jenkins
ARKANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF AT LITTLE ROCK
Chancellor Carey Stabler
ASSOCIATION OF URBAN UNIVERSITIES
George A. Flowers, Editor, News Director, Jacksonville University
Miss Marion Jarrell, Asst. Sec.-Treas., Asst. to the President, Jacksonville University
BOSTON COLLEGE
Mr. and Mrs. Thomas H. O'Conner, Faculty Asst. to the President
BOSTON UNIVERSITY
James H. Baker, Vice President of Public Affairs
BRADLEY UNIVERSITY
President and Mrs. T. W. VanArsdale
CHICAGO STATE COLLEGE
President Milton Byrd, Miss Byrd
CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY
President Harold Enarson
COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD
Mr. and Mrs. Edwin T. Carine, Jr.
DAYTON UNIVERSITY
President Raymond Roesch
DELAWARE, UNIVERSITY OF
Dr. and Mrs. John W. Shirley, Provost & V. Pres., Academic Affairs
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
Albert M. Serling
FAIRLEIGH DICKINSON UNIVERSITY
President J. Osborn Fuller
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
Joseph Mulholland, Assistant Dean
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
President and Mrs. Lloyd Elliott, Vice President, AUU
HOUSTON, UNIVERSITY OF
President and Mrs. Philip Hoffman
ILLINOIS, UNIVERSITY OF AT CHICAGO CIRCLE
Chancellor and Mrs. Norman Parker, President, AUU
Pat Goodall, Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs
ILLINOIS, UNIVERSITY OF
Mr. and Mrs. Barry Munitz, Asst. to the President
INDIANA UNIVERSITY — PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
Dr. and Mrs. John C. Buhner, V. Chancellor and Dean of Faculty

JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY
Dr. Robert H. Spiro, President
JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
Rev. Henry F. Birkenhauer, S. J., President
LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY
Robert D. Bell, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor
LOUISVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF
President & Mrs. Woodrow M. Strickler
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY—CHICAGO
Raymond Baumhart, S. J., President
MASSACHUSETTS, UNIVERSITY OF, IN BOSTON
Francis L. Broderick, Chancellor
MIAMI, UNIVERSITY OF
Dr. M. Robert Allen, Dean, Continuing Education
MINNESOTA HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING COMMISSION
Dr. Donald Draine, Director of Academic Planning
MISSOURI, UNIVERSITY OF, AT KANSAS CITY
Dr. James C. Olson, Chancellor
NEWARK COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
President & Mrs. William Hazell
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
Mrs. Martha S. Luck, Associate Dean, Evening Divisions
PENNSYLVANIA, UNIVERSITY OF
Curtis R. Reitz, Provost and Vice President
PITTSBURGH, UNIVERSITY OF
A. C. Van Duzen, Secretary of the University (Vice Chancellor)
Robert Brictson, Director of Research Program
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
Gregory Baker Wolfe, President
PRATT INSTITUTE
Henry Saltzman, President
ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
Dr. Paul A. Miller, President
ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY
Mr. & Mrs. Ralph Carnes
SAMFORD UNIVERSITY
Dean Hugh Bailey, Dean of Arts and Sciences
SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY
Rev. Jerome J. Marchetti, S. J., Executive Vice President
SOUTH FLORIDA, UNIVERSITY OF
James Clark, Exec. Asst. to the President
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
Paul R. Anderson, President
TENNESSEE, UNIVERSITY OF, KNOXVILLE
Dr. Alvin B. Biscoe, Jr., Assistant Vice President

TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Hortense W. Dixon, Director of Facilities Planning Grant
TUFTS UNIVERSITY
Albert D. Ullman, Senior Vice President and Provost
VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY
Dr. H. I. Willett, Consultant to the President
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY
President & Mrs. A. L. Pugsley
WESTERN NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE
Robert L. Campbell, Academic Vice President
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
Dr. John Breazeale, Vice President for Academic Affairs
and Dean of Faculties
WISCONSIN, UNIVERSITY OF, MILWAUKEE
J. Martin Klotsche, Chancellor

APPENDIX D

Financial Report
November 1, 1969 to October 31, 1970

Bock Balance November 1, 1969		$ 4,118.31
RECEIPTS:		
Annual Meeting	$ 865.01	
Annual Dues 1969-70	6,225.00	
Annual Dues 1970-71	975.00	
Total Receipts		$ 8,065.01
Total Credits		$12,183.32
DISBURSEMENTS:		
Annual Meeting		
Ck. No.		
69-15 Holiday Inn of Downtown Akron, hotel expenses, officers and guests	$122.83	
69-16 Robert Spiro—expenses	33.42	
69-17 Marion Jarrell—expenses	20.75	
69-18 George Flowers—expenses	25.10	
69-20 U. of Akron—expenses	12.00	
69-21 Harry Rivlin—expenses as guest speaker	91.25	
69-22 Zappone Foods—food	545.62	
69-26 Gladys Barbour—transcription of proceedings	194.00	
70-27 U. of Akron—buffet dinner	576.00	
70-39 Jacksonville University—reimburse for tickets and printed program	132.15	
70-50 Photocomposition—proceedings	382.20	
		$ 2,135.32
Newsletter		
Ck. No.		
70-34 Triad Printing Co.	286.00	
70-49 Triad Printing Co.	305.74	
70-58 Triad Printing Co.	249.50	
		$ 841.24
Stipends		
Ck. No.		
69-24 George Flowers—fourth quarter	250.00	
70-25 Marion Jarrell—fourth quarter	250.00	
70-37 George Flowers—first quarter	250.00	
70-38 Marion Jarrell—first quarter	250.00	
70-47 Marion Jarrell—second quarter	250.00	

70-48	George Flowers—second quarter	250.00	
70-56	George Flowers—third quarter	250.00	
70-57	Marion Jarrell—third quarter	250.00	
			$ 2,000.00
	Miscellaneous		
	Ck. No.		
69-23	George Flowers—office supplies	8.00	
70-29	Marion Jarrell—expenses for executive committee meeting	17.32	
70-30	George Flowers—expenses for executive committee meeting	12.65	
70-32	Postmaster—postage for newsletter	7.38	
70-36	Westcott Printing—letterhead	18.46	
70-42	Jacksonville University—reimburse for postage	49.80	
70-43	Jacksonville University—expenses for executive committee meeting	40.25	
70-45	Postmaster—postage for newsletter	7.96	
70-46	Westcott Printing—letterhead	29.64	
70-52	Postmaster—postage for newsletter	7.80	
70-59	Postmaster—postage for proceedings	12.48	
			$ 211.74
	Travel and Dues		
	Ck. No		
69-19	American Council on Education—dues	375.00	
70-28	Norman Parker—annual meeting	56.00	
70-31	Norman Parker—Executive committee meeting	138.75	
70-35	Lloyd Elliott—Executive committee meeting	138.80	
70-41	Jacksonville University—reimburse for Spiro, Flowers, Jarrell, annual meeting	409.05	
70-44	Leo McLaughlin—annual meeting	68.00	
70-51	Cosmopolitan Travel Service Marion Jarrell to Miami	64.00	
70-53	Marion Jarrell—misc. expenses to Miami	8.40	
70-54	Robert Spiro—Chicago	136.48	
70-55	Lloyd Elliott—Chicago	144.80	
			$ 1,539.28
	Total Disbursements, November 1, 1969 to October 31, 1970		$ 6,727.58
	Book Balance, October 31, 1970		$ 5,455.74

APPENDIX E

Procedure For Application For Membership In Association of Urban Universities

Eligible for membership in the Association of Urban Universities are accredited four-year institutions of higher education located in urban areas and particularly concerned with the problems and opportunities incident to urban location, including adult education and other community service. Membership is in the name of the institution, not of a unit or a division of the institution.

Ninety-two institutions are now members of the Association, which was organized in 1914. The annual meeting is usually held on the first Sunday and Monday in November in the "home" city of one of the member institutions. Proceedings of the annual meeting are published. A Newsletter containing items of interest to urban institutions is issued periodically during the year. Annual institutional dues are $75.00.

Applications for membership may be made by letter addressed to the Secretary-Treasurer, Dr. Robert Spiro, President, Jacksonville University, Jacksonville, Florida. The letter should be accompanied by a statement concerning the accrediting of the institution, its objectives and its interest in community service. Also, there should be a brief statement concerning institutional history and organization, enrollment, and nature of educational service. One or two publications of the institution will be of interest to the Membership Committee.

Attendance at annual meetings is not limited to representatives of member institutions but is open to interested representatives from any urban institution. An institution applying for membership is expected ot be represented at the annual meeting at which its application is considered.

Is is expected that presidents of member institutions will personally participate in the work of the Association and, whenever possible, attend the annual meeting.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

APPENDIX F

Institutional Libraries Holding Complete Sets of Proceedings of the Association's Annual Meetings

University of Akron
Boston University (The Chenery Library)
Butler University
University of Cincinnati
University of Chicago
City College of New York
University of Denver
Drexel Institute of Technology
Harvard University (Harvard College Library)
University of Illinois
University of Louisville
New York University (Washington Square Library)
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
University of Rochester
Rutgers University
University of Southern California
State University of New York at Buffalo
Syracuse University
Temple University
University of Toledo
Wayne State University
Western Reserve University